THE PHILOSOPHY OF NIMBARKĀ

THE PHILOSOPHY OF NIMBĀRKA

By
MADAN MOHAN AGRAWAL
M. A., PH D
Department of Sanskrit
Banasthalı Vıdyapith, Banasthali (Raj)

Exclusive Distributors :
JAIN BOOK DEPOT
AGRA ROAD,
HATHRAS-204101
PHONE-480
4056, AJMERI GATE
DELHI-110006
PHONE-529200

Published by :
Shrimati Usha Agrawal
Gali Manihar, Sadabad (Mathura)

Edition : 1979

Price : Rs. 50-00

Jainsons'Printers, Takia Wazir Shah, Sethgali, Agra-3

FOREWORD

I have great pleasure in introducing to the world of scholars Dr Madan Mohan Agrawal's doctoral thesis entitled 'The Philosophy of Nimbārka' now being published in a book-form The Nimbārka school of Vaiṣṇavism has remained neglected or rather not fully explored by modern scholars, mainly due to the fact that the followers of this school did not pay much attention to propogate their philosophical teachings through publications and remained devoted in search of Ultimate Reality and God-realization One question has still to find out its answer as to why there is no reference to Sānkarabhāṣya in Nimbārka's commentary on the Brahma-Sutra entitled 'The Vedānta-Pārijāta-Saurabha', and why Nimbarka has not refuted the views of opponents as Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Vallabha, Śrīkantha, and Baladeva Vidyabhūṣana have done Obviously, a serious study on Nimbārka school is still a desiderratum Even today, unfortunately, all the basic texts of Nimbārka-school are beyond the reach of scholars and even when available are in the form of corrupt and popular editions Primarily, on account of lack of academic interest on the part of the followers of this school no critical edition of any Sanskrit text of this school has so far been prepared We come across wrong entries of the works of Nimbārka-school under the name of Vallabha in the monumental 'Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts' (Madras)

Only two scholars have made notable contribution on this branch of Indian Philosophy Dr. Roma Bose published her erudide Oxford thesis entitled 'The Vedānta Pārijāta-Saurabha' in 3 volumes Surprisingly in these volumes only 10 times find place on the 'Parapaksagirivajra' of Mādhavamukundācārya It seems this outstanding and representative book of Nimbārka-school was probably not available to this learned author Dr Umesh Misra is another eminent scholar who published a small but valuable study 'The Nimbārka School of Vedānta'

The present book in two parts, viz, (1) The Dvaitādvaita

Philosophy, (2) Relation of Jīva and Brahman, is a result of painstaking research and critical evaluation of various philosophical issues along modern methods of scientific research. I have no hesitation to say that Dr. Agrawal has vested meticulous labour in it's preparation, while working for a Ph.D. at the Aligarh Muslim University and has succeeded in making some advancement in the field. It is gratifying to note that the author has also shown clear understanding of Kashmir Śaivism by making a reference to the 'Sambandhasiddhi' of Utpaladeva, on the 'Concept of Relation'. The origin and development of the doctrine of Difference–Non-difference has been dealt with in its historical set up. The Svābhāvika Bhedābheda of Nimbārka and a comparative study of the relation of Jīva and Brahman form the pivot of this book. The book will be of great help for all those who are interested in this branch of Vedānta. I congratulate Dr. Agrawal for this excellent work and very much wish that he further pursues this still insufficiently unexplored treasure-trove of Nimbārka-Vedānta. He will, however, remember that a Ph. D. degree simply is the beginning of researches rather than the consumination of a deep and scholarly result. I believe that the book will bring credit reputation to Dr. Madan Mohan Agrawal.

—Rasik Vihari Joshi

Prof. and Head of the
Department of Sanskrit,
University of Delhi, Delhi.
March 1, 1977.

INTRODUCTION

Nimbārka was a great saint and a philosopher of high order His heart was full of human love and his mind was occupied in the revealiation of the mystery of the world Whenever love and spiritual experiences combine together the nature around appears as a novel and has a new form Therefore the cosmic world was realized by Nimbārka as Acintyavicitrasansthānasampanna This was a great discovery The value of the statement has not yet been fully discussed Nimbārka himself made an analytical approach to the nature of the world and declared it as cidācida-rupa But behind that he was able to have glimpses of some controlling authority whom he calls as Brhattama and Purușottama on the basis of anantācintyaśakti and identifies him as Ramākānta This identification naturally created in him an intense-desire to see Him in personal form (taddarśanecchālam-pata) and to seek the Grace of the God (Bhagavat-prasāda) Thus, Bhakti and jñāna have joined their hands together in the philosophy of Nimbārka Ultimately Nimbārka accepted Bhedābhedadarśana on the anology of Ahikundala Keśava Kaśmīrī and other followers of his system have explained the concepts of Brahman and Jīva and their relation in their works and Dr Madan Mohan Agrawal, following these great writers, has explained further the basic ideas of Nimbārka in the present book which is quite interesting and deserves recognition

—*Ram Suresh Tripathi*

Prof and Head of the
Department of Sanskrit,
Aligarh Muslim University,
Aligarh

March 1, 1977

PREFACE

The present work was submitted for an All India Essay Competition organized by Sanskrit Sahitya Parishad, Calcutta, in 1969 ; and for the degree of doctor of Philosophy (Ph D) at the Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh in 1970 in part one and two respectively The Dvaitādvaita Philosophy (part I) and The Relation of Jīva and Brahman (part II) are both jointly published here No independent work has so far been done on the relation of Jīva and Brahman The concept of relation has been the central point of discussion among Non dualist, Saivite and Vaiṣnavite scholars The Nimbārka-school of Vaisnavism has also not remainded behind in this context and has made notable contribution to the subject True, Dr Roma Bose, Dr Umesh Misra and some other scholars have worked on this system of Indian Philosophy, but the question of relation almost remains neglected I have endeavoured to discuss the different types of relation of difference and non-difference, origin and development of difference and non difference, with special reference to natural difference and non difference

I am most grateful to my Guru Dr Ram Suresh Tripathi, M A , Ph D , D Litt (Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh) for his valuable, scholarly and affectionate guidance during my research period He not only made available to me several texts of this school, but also explained to me the difficult portions of these texts and properly initiated me into the modern methods of scientific research I am all the more grateful to him for kindly contributing an 'Introduction' to this edition I also owe my debt to Dr Rasik Vihari Joshi, M A , Ph D D Litt (Paris), who always enlightened me and explained the deep and esoteric interpretation of Nimbarka Philosophy even through correspondence during his stay in U S A and Mexico I offer my sincere thanks to Prof Rasik Vihari Joshi, Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit, University of Delhi for his kindly

writing a 'Foreword' to my book. My sincere thanks are also due to Late Prof. K.C. Pandey, M.A., Ph.D., D. Litt., M. O. L., Shastri (Ex-Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Lucknow University, Lucknow) for his valuable suggestions.

I should further thank Prof. Antonio Gargano (Director, Publications & Cultural Deptt., Istituto Italiano, per il Medio Ed Estremo Oriento, Via Merulana, 248, Rome (Italy), Mr. Boccard (Editions E. De Boccard, 1, Rue de Médicis—Paris-IV), the librarians of the National Library, Calcutta and Asiatic Society, Calcutta; and the officers of Śrījī Kuñja, Vrindavan for their kind help in sending certain rare articles and books to me and permitting me to consult their libraries, specially unpublished manuscripts which helped me much in bringing out the heart of the Nimbārka Philosophy. To Dr. Rameshwara Gupta, Ex-Principal and Professor & Head of the Department of English, Banasthali Vidyapith, Banasthali (Raj.), I offer my sincere thanks for his kindness in going through my manuscript. I shall feel amply rewarded if this work throws fresh light on the hitherto unexplored field of Nimbārka-system of Indian Philosophy.

āparitoṣād viduṣām na sādhū manye prayogavijñānam /
balavadapi śikṣitānām ātmani apratyayam cetah //

March 1, 1977
Banasthali Vidyapith,
Banasthali (Raj.)

—MADAN MOHAN AGRAWAL

CONTENTS

Chapter *Page*

PART I

DVAITĀDVAITA PHILOSOPHY

PART II

RELATION OF JĪVA AND BRAHMAN

PART I

Dvaitādvaita Philosophy

1

THE DVAITĀDVAITA PHILOSOPHY

1 THE CONCEPT OF DVAITĀDVAITA

What is 'dvaitādvaita'? If we say that, "a thing which is known in two ways, is 'dvīta' (dvi+i (in gatau)+ta), and 'dvīta' is merely 'dvaita' on account of Svārthika Pratyaya (abstract affix)—(dvidhā itam dvītam tasya bhāvah svārthe an), then 'advaita', which is derived by Nañ Samāsa (negative compound)—(na dvaitam iti advaitam), or, is different from 'dvaita', will be a thing which is known in only one way"[1] Thus, 'dvaitādvaita' may be interpreted by Karmadhāraya Samāsa (appositional compound), which is "dvaitam ca tat advaitam ca", or, a thing which we may be able to know in two ways as well as in one way, is called 'dvaitādvaita'

An objection may be raised here, the statement that 'dvaita' is a thing which is known in two ways and 'advaita' a thing which is not known in two ways raises a question How is it possible that a thing is known in two ways as well as not known in two ways? Similarly, how can the Karmadhāraya Samāsa (appositional compound) between these contradictory terms, viz dvaita and advaita be possible?

The answer is as follows 'dvīta' is that which is known by two mutually different kinds like independent reality and dependent reality, sentient-insentient etc That is merely 'dvaita' on account of Svārthika Pratyaya (abstract affix) In reality the term 'dvaita' is similar to diversity

---

1 dvābhyām caiva prakārābhyamitam taddvītamucyate /
dvītam tadeva dvaitam syādadvaitam tu tatonyathā //
—Dvaitādvaita Vivekah of Srī Bhagiratha Jhā,
p 1, Vrndavan, 1945

And, 'advaita' is different from 'dvaita': A thing which has Brahman for its essence, is called 'advaita', Cit and acit have Brahman for their essence on account of the power of Brahman, or, being dependent on Brahman. It shows that there is advaita between cit, acit and Brahman.

Thus, 'dvaita' is known by diversity, and 'advaita' is known by one, which has Brahman for its essence (Brahmātmaka). For example, the ear-ring is different from the bracelet in name and shape simply on account of Kuṇḍalattva and Kaṭakattva, but is non-different, so far as gold is concerned. Similarly, cit and acit are different from Brahman in nature, but are non-different, so far as Brahman is concerned, or, all things are Brahman in their essence. It shows that there is no occasion for any contradiction in the mutually contradictory terms of 'dvaita' and 'advaita'; or, they do co-exist. In the very same manner, there may be also the Karmadhāraya Samāsa (appositional compound) in the term 'dvaitādvaita', because, there is co-existence (sāmānādhikaraṇa) in 'dvaitādvaita'.

2 THE CONCEPT OF JĪVA

Jīva is the only sentient reality. Śrī Nimbārkācārya has given the following characteristics of the Jīva in his Vedānta-kāmadhenu:

> "Jñānasvarūpaṁ ca hareradhīnaṁ,
> śarīrasaṁyogaviyogayogyaṁ /
> Aṇuṁ hi Jīvaṁ pratidehabhinnaṁ,
> jñātṛtvavantaṁ yadanantamāhuḥ // [Verse 1]

(The Jīva is knowledge by nature, dependent on Hari and capable to be associated with and dissociated from a body; atomic, different in different bodies; and a knower and infinite).

(A) The Jīva is knowledge[1] by nature. It is a special quality of the Jīva, which delights the entire body, just as the odour of the flower. As proved by the śruti: "He has entered here

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 26 and Vedānta-Kāmadhenu, Verse 1.

up to the body-hairs and finger-nails [1] "On account of this special quality of the Jīva, it is different from the non-sentient, viz, the body, the sense-organs (eleven in number), the vital breath (with its five modes), the mind and buddhi [2]

Being the essence of the Jīva, knowledge is present in every state, viz the states of walking, dream, deep sleep, swoon and death It is present even in the state of deep sleep and the rest

An objection may be raised here where is it present during the state of deep sleep, as it is present during the state of walking? The answer to this question is as follows It is *manifested during the walking state and is in its own possession* (self-possessed) during the state of deep sleep. Just as youth is present even in child-age, though it is not manifested in child-age, yet is manifested in young age [3]

The Jīva being a knowledge, is a knower[4] as well

An objection may be raised here the Jīva cannot be both knowledge and knower. Just as one drop of water is identical with water[5], so knowledge is identical with knower Here, the Jīva is not a knower, but pure knowledge

To this the answer is as follows there is not contradiction[6] between knowledge and knower, and are not in identity with each other. In many cases, we find that the substratum (dharmin) and the attribute (dharma) are very similar, but that does not mean that they are identical Just as a gem and its rays are equally luminous, yet they are different and they stand in the relation of substratum (dharmin) and attribute (dharma) [7] Similarly, though the Jīva and its quality of knowledge are

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 3 26
2 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p 4
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 3 30
4 Ibid, 1 2 12, 1 3. 5, 2 3 18.
5 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p 4
6 Ibid
7 Ibid.

equally knowledge, yet they stand in relation of substratum and attribute, so there is distinction between them, and there is no identity, as is clear from the scripture: "Seated on the body by knowledge."[1] Thus, there is difference between one drop of water and water, for that drop of water, having a distinct form, must be different from other drops of water.[2]

The Jīva being a knower, is an Ego or 'I' (*ahaṁ*).[3] A knower always feels 'I know', 'I want', 'I do', etc.[4] 'Ahamartha' does not consist of two factors, one intelligence and the other non-intelligence.[5] It is not unreal but is the essence of the Jīva.

It is objected here, that if an Ego or 'I' is real or the essence of the Jīva, it must always exist along with it. But the 'I' no longer exists in the state of deep sleep, salvation etc. so, the 'I' is an effect of prakṛti.[6]

The answer to this question is as follows : The 'I' is present even in deep sleep, as is proved from such memory as "For hsuc a long time I slept happily and did not know anything". It shows, the 'I' is present even in deep sleep as the substratum of knowledge and the feeling of happiness. Even the memory "For such a long time I did not know even myself", does not show the absence of 'I' during the state of deep sleep. But it means that it is present even in deep sleep, what is absent is the 'I' as it is during the walking state. Hence, the 'I' must persis t even during the states of deep sleep, swoon and the rest.[7]

The Jīva, being an Ego, is a doer.[8] It is proved by all spiritual injunctions : for example : "one who desires to go to

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 27.
2 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 5.
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 18.
4 Vedānt-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 7.
5 Dvayanśatāpi na ca bhāti cetanānām pratitivisayehamarthake —Sarviśeṣa-Nirviśeṣa-Kṛṣṇastavarāja—verse 21.
6 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 7.
7 Ibid., p. 8.
8 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 32-40.

svarg should perform sacrifices", or "one who desires salvation should worship the Brahman".[1] On account of its movement it is a doer as declared by Śruti : "The Jīva moves, within the body at will",[2] or "Thus, moves taking the vital breath."[3] This also proves that the Jīva is a doer. It means that the Jīva is a material cause, being a knower and enjoyer as far as possible, of the vital breath, the sense organs and the buddhi etc. The sentence that, "Vijñāna performs sacrifice,"[4] also proves that the Jīva is a doer. Here one might ask does not 'vijñāna' mean 'buddhi' ? To this our reply would be : No ; because buddhi is not the doer itself but is an impelling force. The fact is that the Jīva is only a doer.

An objection may be raised here, if the Jīva is only a doer, it must always do only pure actions from which it could get only pleasure, but why does it do impure actions ? The answer to this question is as follows :

There is no law governing the fruits of the past deeds. The Jīva does its actions impelled by past deeds, and at that time it does not know about purity or impurity of deeds. So, even though a doer, the Jīva is ruled by the deeds.[5] If we accept that buddhi is the doer, then what will be the impelling power for the doer, which is a necessity ? So, the Jīva is only a doer.[6]

The Jīva does its actions as it desires just as a carpenter does his work or does not do his work as he desires. This agreement is possible in the Jīva, but is not possible in the buddhi. So buddhi is not the doer,[7] the Jīva is the only doer.

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., 2. 3. 33.
3 Ibid., 2. 3. 34.
4 Ibid., 2. 3. 35.
5 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 2. 3. 36.
6 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 37.
7 Ibid., 2. 3. 39.

The Jīva is a doer not only during the state of mundane existence, but also in its state of salvation. As is clear from the fact that it performs the Samādhi. It is a doer.

The Jīva is an enjoyer or bhoktā.[2] It is proved from such memory of deep sleep : "For such a long time I slept happily," and it enjoys supreme bliss produced from its direct vision of Brahman during the salvation-state.[3] Thus it continues to be so during deep sleep and salvation.

The Jīva, being the knower, the doer, the enjoyer it could be said that the Jīva must be like the Brahman. To this doubt the siddhānti replies that, it is not independent, but is dependent on Hari[4] and its activity, existence, knowledge, enjoyment everything is dependent on Brahman. For example : the earthen jar is of the nature of clay, hence the existence and the activity of the jar is dependent on clay. It is proved by śruti. "Entered within, the controller of men".[5] Whatever the Lord, who has regard for the works done by the Jīva, makes it do good deeds and the rest in another birth too, on account of the futility of what is enjoined and what is prohibited.[6] Even when it attains similarity to Brahman during the state of salvation, it remains under his control.

The Jīva is without birth and death-eternal.[7] But, according to prima-facie view that "Devadutta is born and dead" so the Jiva is born and dies. It is only figurative, there is no birth and death of the Jīva, and it implies only that the material body is born or dies. In the presence of an existence of body, it is (its birth and death) natural. So the Jīva is neither born nor does it die, it is eternal (aja) as declared by the scripture itself : A wise man

1 Ibid., 2. 3. 38.
2 Ibid., 1. 3. 7, 3. 2. 13.
3 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 12.
4 Vedānta-Kāmadhenu, Verse 1.
5 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 40.
6 Vedānta-pārijāta Saurabha, 2. 3. 41.
7 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 16-17.

is neither born nor dies, Eternal among the eternal, An unborn one, indeed, lies by enjoying" It is also proved by Smṛti "unborn, eternal, constant and ancient he is not killed when the body is killed"

The Jīva is a part of Brahman.[1] Here, the 'part' means 'power'.[2] It means Jiva is power of Brahman "All the beings are a foot of the Lord"[3] it also proves that the Jīva is a part of Brahman It is also proved by Smṛti "Just my part, the Jīva came in the world of mortals as the eternal"[4]

Here it may be asked the Jīva is a part of Brahman, so Brahman must experience pleasure and pain like the Jīva. To this objection, it is said that the Jīva experiences pleasure and pain under the influence of its past deeds, but Brahman does not experience any such feeling, just as the defects of light, which is the part, do not affect the sun, who is the whole[5]

Thus, in nature the Jīva is knowledge, a knower, a doer and an enjoyer, under the control of Brahman and a also part of the Brahman all these things are true of the Jīva in bondage as well as in salvation

(B) The size of the Jīva is very minute (atomic or anuparimāna)[6] If we accept the medium size, the Jīva will also be perishable like the jar The followers of this siddhānt accept the size of the Jīva according to the size of the body Thus, the size of the soul of an elephant will be as huge as the body of the elephant The size of the intelligence of an ant will be as small as the body of an ant This will create the following difficulty

When the intelligence of an elephant will obtain the body of

---

1 Ibid, 2 3 42
2 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 2 3 42
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 3 43
4 Ibid, 2 3 44
5 Ibid, 2 3 45
6 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 3 19 and Vedānta Kāmadhenu, Verse 1.

an ant, or, when the intelligence of an ant will obtain the body of an elephant, it will be rather impossible for both of them to enter into the body of one another. Hence the outlook of the Maddhyam parimāṇavādin cannot be accepted.[1]

The all-pervading size of the Jīva is also defective. If we accept the all-pervading size, then the utkrānti (going of the soul out of the body), gati (going of the soul to the higher worlds, like moon, etc.) and āgati (return of the soul from other worlds in this world) of the Jīva should not occur, because the all-pervading entity cannot move. Only supreme Brahman is of the nature of all-pervasiveness. Hence the outlook of vibhuparimāṇavādin cannot be accepted.[2]

Consequently, we have to accept the size of the Jīva as the most minute one (aṇu). This is from the text : "This soul goes out through the eye, or through the head, or through other parts of the body." "Whoever, go forth from this world all go to the moon alone." "Returning from that world to this world for action," and so on.[3] This is clearly declared by the scripture as well which says : ,'The Jīva is as subtle as a hair-point divided and subdivided hundreds of times."[4]

Here it may be asked : the Jīva being atomic how can it experience the feelings of pleasure and pain of the entire body ? To this, we reply : Just as a drop of sandal wood-paste in one part of the body can soothe and enlighten the entire body, so, the Jīva, though it occupies only a point in the body, enlightens the entire body and experiences the feelings of pleasure and pain of the entire body.[5]

---

1 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 2. 3. 19.
2 Ibid., 2. 3. 19, 2. 3. 21.
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 19.
4 (A) Ibid., 2. 3. 22.
(B) Joshi, Rasik Vihari : 'A Note on the Doctrine of Non-difference in Difference of Nimbārka', East and West, Vol. 15, No.2, January 1964, March 1965, ISMEO, Rome.
5 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 23.

Further, it may be objected The example of sandal wood-paste is not suitable, on account of the speciality of residence To this objection, we reply The Jīva, too, dwells into heart, viz, in one part of the bodv does not dwell everywhere as a consciousness, just as the sandal wood paste [1]

Thus, the Jīva is atomic in size, in bondage as well as in salvation [2]

(C) The Jīva is innumerable in number The Ekajivavādin admits only Jīva in the universe None has, so far, attained final liberation Whenever that one Jiva will be liberated, the whole world will disappear

To refute this doctrine, Nimbārkācārya propounded that in each body the Jīva is a separate being limited by that body [3] It proves that in all the beings Brahman is one but Jīva is separate and infinite Both Brahman and Jīva are possessed of mutual distinguishing marks In case, we do not accept a separate Jīva in each body, then all the individual souls should sleep after the sleeping of one, and all should be unconscious when one becomes unconscious Similarly, when one feels happy or unhappy all should feel alike This never happens Hence the outlook of Ekajīvavādin cannot be accepted [4]

Nevertheless the scriptural injunctions prove that the Jiva is not one (endless) It is many while Brahman is one There is a great difference by nature between the Jiva and Brahman In the passage "He who staying in the self, internally controls the self, He is the immortal self, eternal of all the eternals, animate of all animates, and being one without a second makes many desires "[5] In evidence, all the three epithets, nityanām, cetanānām,

---

1 Ibid, 2 3 24

2 Vedānta Kaustubha, 4 4 15

3 Pratidehabhinnam—Vedanta Kāmadhenu, Verse 1

4 Vedānta-ratna mañjūṣā, p 19

5 Ya ātmani tisthan ātmānāmantaro yamayati /
eṣa tu ātmānan taryāmyāmrtah //
nityo nityānam cetanaścetanānām /
Eko bahūnām yo vidadhāti kāmān// —Kathaka Up, II, 2 13

bahunām, prove that the self is endless. The Brahmasūtra states that the Brahman in Jīva, who is śarīrābhimānin, is different by nature.[1] It also establishes that Brahman is different from Jīva.[2] The omniscient and omnipotent ultimate reality is definitely superior to the Jīva. The Bhagavatgītā also remarks : "O Arjuna ! It is not true that I was present before, I, you, and all these kings are never present in present, past and future."[3] In this way the natural difference between Brahman and Jīva is strongly established.

When we accept infinite Individual souls, the question is that by propitiation one by one each individual soul will attain the final liberation and a stage will come when all the individual souls will attain *mukti*, and the creation will come to an end. The answer of this question is explicitly given by Nimbārkācārya in the course of the definition of the Jīva under the words 'yadanantamāhuh' The Jīva is innumerable and endless, will never come to an end. The whole of the universe is full of the beings who have gross, subtle, and minute bodies.[4]

(D) There are broadly speaking two kinds of the Jīva, viz. Baddha and Mukta.[5]

(i) *Baddha*, that is, one who is pointed out by the term 'unborn one' (aja), eternal by nature, carried away by the current

---

1 Bhedavyapadeśāccānyaḥ

—Brahmasūtra.

2 Adhikaṁ tu bhedanirdeśāt

—Brahmasūtra, 2.1.21

3 Na tvevāhaṁ jātu nāśaṁ na tvam neme janādhipaḥ /
na caiva na bhavisyāmaḥ sarve vayamataḥ paraṁ //

—Gītā, 2. 12.

4 (A) Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 19.
(B) Joshi, Rasik Vihari : 'A Note on the Doctrine of Nondifference in Difference of Nimbārka', "East and West", Vol. 15, No. 1-2., Jan. 1964, March 1965, ISMEO, Rome.

5 Muktaṁ ca baddhaṁ kila baddhamuktaṁ /
Prabhedabāhulyamathaiṣu bodhyaṁ //

—Vedānta-Kāmadhenu, Verse 2.

of beginningless deeds,[1] and devoid of a true knowledge of the real nature of itself or of the supreme being. One who has identified itself through nescience with the body of a god, or of a man, or of any other being, who is a modification of prakṛti, and is experiencing sounds and the rest, the parts of prakṛti, and is devoid of the supreme bliss.[2] Baddhas are of two kinds, viz. Mumukṣus and bubhukṣus. Mumukṣus, again, are of two kinds,viz., bhagavatabhāvāpatti and nijasvarūpāpatti ; bubhukṣus are of two kinds, viz., bhāviśreyaskah and nityasamsārī.[3]

(ii) *Mukta*, that is, one who has attained fortunately the grace of the Lord through his poor and pitiable condition, and has attained the supreme bliss through the practice of hearing, thinking and meditating of the vedānta by attending upon the feet of his Guru and who refuses prakṛti.[4] Muktas are of two kinds, viz., nityamuktas and muktas. Nityamuktas, again, are of two kinds, viz., Ānantaryya and pārsada ; muktas are of two kinds, viz., bhagavatabhāvāpatti and nijasvarūpāpatti.[5]

The characteristics of the Baddha and the Mukta Jīva are very much the same. That is, like the Baddha-Jīva, the Mukta-Jīva also is knowledge by nature and a knower, a doer, an enjoyer, atomic and infinite. Hence, although the characteristics of a Baddha and a Mukta-Jīva are apparently the same, really these are not so. It is undoubtedly true, that a Mukta-Jīva too, is knowledge by nature, a knower, a doer, an enjoyer, atomic and infinite ; yet it is entirely different from a Baddha-Jīva, because it is all the above in an entirely different sense.[6]

---

1 Anādimāyāpariyuktarūpaṁ /
tvenamvidurvai bhagavat-prasādāt // —Vedānta Kāmadhenu 4. 2

2 Vedānta-kaustubha, 1. 4. 10.
3 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 22.
4 Vedānta-kaustubha, 1. 4. 10.
5 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, pp. 22-23.
6 Chaudhuri Dr. (Mrs.) Roma, "Nimbārka's Theory of Self" 'Finite-Self', Ed. by Swami, B. H. Bon Maharaj, Vrindavan, 1963.

3. THE CONCEPT OF JAGAT

This concept has been clearly explained by Śrī Nimbārkācārya in the following verse of the *Vedānta-kāmadhenu* :—

> Aprākṛtaṁ prākṛtarūpakaṁ ca /
> kālasvarūpaṁ tadacetanaṁ mataṁ //
> māyāpradhānādipadapravācyaṁ /
> śuklādibhedaśca samepi tatra // [Verse 3]

"The acit or Jagat is of three kinds, viz. (1) Aprākṛta—not derived from prakṛti. (2) Prākṛta—derived from prakṛti (3) Kāla, the time. In the things of prākṛta we have the ordinary material objects, it consists of three Guṇas, viz., *sattva, rajas*, and *tamas.*" The process of creation and destruction is as follows :[1]

In creation first the ether originates from the Lord, from the ether air, from air fire, from fire water, and from water earth, in èvery case, Lord is the real creator. In destruction, the process is just the reverse of the process of creation, viz., first the earth is merged in water, water in fire, fire in air, air in ether, and the ether in the Lord. Just as salt is merged in water.

In that process the acit or Jagat is the effect of Brahman and abides in Brahman.

4. THE CONCEPT OF BRAHMAN

In the philosophy of Nimbārka, the absolute ultimate reality is Śrīkṛṣṇa himself. He is denoted by the term "Brahman", who has inherent nature, attributes, powers and so on.[2] He is Lord of cause of causes. He is controller of all. He is Lord of all.[3] He is variously known as : Kṛṣṇa, Hari, Ramākānta, Puruṣottama, Keśava, Mādhava, Bhagawān, etc.[4] and on his left

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 1-14.
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 1. 1, Vedānta Kāmadhenu, Verse 4.
3 Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 3. 4. 22.
4 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, Saviśeṣa-Nirviśeṣa kṛṣṇa-stavarāj, —Vedānta Kāmadhenu.

side the daughter of Vṛṣabhānu (Rādhikā) is illuminated with a corresponding beauty, who is attended on by thousands of female friends and who is the giver of all desired objects[1] This concept of Brahman has been clearly explained by Srinīmbārkācārya in the following verse of Vedānta-kāmadhenu (Daśaśloki)

> Svabhāvatopāstasamastadosa-
> maśeṣakalyānagunaikarāśim /
> vyuhānginam brahma param varenyam
> dhyayem kṛsnam kamaleksanam harim /
>
> —*Vedānta-kāmadhenu*, Verse 4

(I meditate on the Supreme Brahman, viz Kṛsna, Harī, who has eyes like the lotus, who naturally has destroyed all the defects, is the store of all auspicious attributes Whose body is represented by the vyūha and who is attended by all)

(A) By nature, Brahman has destroyed all the defects, viz, the five kinds of kleśas such as avidyā (nescience), asmita (egoism), rāga (passion), dveṣa (aversion), abhinivesa (the will-to live) These kleśas are denoted by the words tama, moha, mahāmoha, tāmisra, andhatāmisra Tama (nescience) covers the real nature of things, moha is confounding the body with the soul, mahāmoha is that which hankers after enjoyment, tāmisra, viz, Malice, andhatāmisra, viz death He is absolutely free from the six kinds of modifications (vikāras) such as birth, existence, growth, transformation, decay and death He is free from three gunas, viz, sattva, raja, and tama Nevertheless, the authorities of the sruti prove that he is free from all sins, without old age, without death, without grief, without hunger, without thirst He has true desires, and true volitions" "He is not affected by the deeds, klesas (hindrances), fruitions of karma (vipaka) and so on"[2]

On the other hand, He is endowed with all the auspicious attributes and qualities like knowledge, power, strength, sovereignty,

---

1 Vedānta-Kāmadhenu, Verse 5

2 Vedānta ratna mañjūṣā, pp 43 44, Vedānta pārijāta-saurabha, 3 2 11, 30

energy, valour, sauśīlya, vātsalya, mārdava, ārjava, sauhārda, etc. Knowledge—the direct perception of all space, time and objects; power—the capacity of making the impossible; strength—the power of supporting the entire universe ; sovereignty—the power of controlling everything, energy—tirelessness inspite of continued and unlimited labour, valour—the capacity of defeating all without being ever defeated by them. These six qualities of Brahman help him in creating the universe. Sauśīlya—to be connected with all without considering the lowliest and the most unworthy, inspite of his own greatness ; vātsalya—never looking at the faults of His devotees ; mārdava--non-endurance of the miseries of those who are dependent on Him ; ārjava—the perfectness of mind and speech ; Sauhārda—the dilligence to protect others ; Sarvaśaraṇya or somya—being the place of refuge of all ; kāruṇya—the nature of destroying the faults of others; sthiratva—remaining steady in wars ; dhairya—maintaining promises ; dayā—feeling grieved at the grief of others without any cause, and being desirous of removing their griefs ; mādhurya—having sweetness like the nectar etc. All these qualities of Brahman help Him in the protection of those who are dependent on Him.[1]

The Lord is all blissful and is the source of bliss to all Jīvas. His bliss is unlimited.[2] Through His bliss, He desires to be many and creates the universe.[3] As declared by śruti, "He desired : may I be many and may I procreate. He created all this."[4]

The Lord has a physical body upon which those desirous of salvation meditate. Meditation, too, is possible only if the Lord has a body.[5] Śruti speaks also that the Lord has physical body. "The person who is seen within the sun, having a golden beard, having

1 Vedānta-ratnamañjūṣā, pp. 44-45, Vedānta-pārijáta saurabha, 1. 2. 2.
2 Ibid., 1. 3. 9.
3 Ibid., 1. 1. 17.
4 Taittirīyopaniṣad, 2. 61.
5 Vedānta-kaustubha, 1. 1. 21.

golden hair etc"[1] The person who is seen in the eyes,"[2] and so on

Brahman is denoted by the words such as Ether, vital—breath, light, Gāyatrī metre, etc[3] He has spiritual body[4], the śruti speaks also, "spiritual, having the vital—breath for the body, of the form of light, having true volitions etc[5] He is the eater of the movable and the immovable[6] He is great and all-pervasive[6] He is the object to be worshipped and the object to be known[8] This Lord is the immortal, the fearless, this is Brahman[9] He is all happiness,[10] He is the controller of all, is the seer of all, is the inner controller[11] He is invisible and omniscient[12] He is imperishable, is all-pervading[13] His nature is everpresent and is the cause of the appearance of the nature of Jīva[14] Brahman is the omniscient, omnipotent[15] It is known by all creation, viz movable and immovable He is the whole of Jiva[16] He is the maker of all which are seen in dream and are indicative of pure and impure fruits[17] Through His desire the Jiva's bondage and salvation arise, as declared by sruti "The cause of the world, bondage, abiding and salvation[18] Brahman is not en-

1 Chāndogyopanisad, 1 6 6
2 Ibid, 1 7 5
3 Vedānta-pārijāta saurabha, 1 1 23-31
4 Ibid, 1 2 2
5 Chāndogyopanisad, 3 14 2
6 Vedānta pārijāta-saurabha, 1 2 9
7 Ibid, 1 2 10
8 Ibid, 1 2 12
9 Ibid, 1 2 13
10 Ibid, 1 2 15
11 Ibid, 1 2 19-20
12 Ibid, 1 2 22
13 Ibid, 1 2 23, 1 3 10
14 Ibid, 1 3 19-20
15 Ibid, 1 4 14
16 Ibid, 2 3 42
17 Ibid, 3 2 4, 7
18 Ibid, 3 2 5

joyer.[1] Though he is abiding within all sentient and non-sentient, yet He is not touched by their defects, is endowed with His all auspicious attributes, just as: the sun, reflected on different water-houses, does not participate in the defects of their increase and decrease. As śruti speaks: "He is not smeared with the misery of the world."[2] Brahman is unmanifest. "He is not perceivable through the eyes nor by speach, and so on,"[3] but He becomes manifest through the loving devotion and meditation. Just as there is manifestation of the sun, fire and like through the repetition of the means resorted to by those who long for them. As declared by śruti and smṛti : "He, with his nature purified through the clarification of the knowledge of Brahman, perceives, meditating him who is without parts", and "O Arjuna, I may be known through exclusive devotion, and, O paramatapa : perceived in truth, and entered through exclusive devotion."[4] Brahman is unlimited, but He becomes limited for those devotees who meditate Him, just as the lusture of the sun through a window.[5] Brahman alone is the giver of fruits of all deeds in accordance with particular duties to which they are entitled.[6]

Thus, by nature Brahman has destroyed all the defects and is endowed with all attributes and qualities.

(B) Brahman is the cause of the universe.[7] Brahman alone is the cause of the creation and destruction of the universe. All names and forms arise from Him and return to Him[8].

Brahman is both material cause and efficient cause (upādāna and nimitta kāraṇa) of the universe.[9] As declared by

1 Ibid., 3. 2. 13.
2 Ibid., 3. 2. 11, 20, 30.
3 Ibid., 3. 2. 23.
4 Ibid., 3. 2. 24-25.
5 Ibid., 3. 2. 32-34.
6 Ibid., 3. 2. 38.
7 Ibid., 1. 1. 10-12, 19, 2. 1. 35, 2. 3. 8, 13.
8 Ibid., 1. 3. 42.
9 Ibid., 1. 4. 23-27.

the śruti : Brahman was the forest, Brahman the tree from which they cut off the heaven and the earth O learned man, ask through the mind whereon it stood supporting the worlds "[1] It is the material cause in the sense that it enables its natural saktis capacity, viz , the cit and the acit in their subtle forms, to be manifested in gross forms , and it is the efficient cause in the sense that it unites the individual souls with their respective fruits of actions and means of enjoyments. Thus, the creation of the universe is nothing but a manifestation in a gross form of what was subtle before and is thus a sort of modification or parināma [2]

Parināma means modification or transformation or actual change, resulting in an effect having equal reality with the material cause, or, production of an effect that has same kind of (either real or unreal) existence as that of its material cause The example of the transformation of milk into curds is often quoted In this school of thought, there is entire modification of the substance, name and form of the cause The change of the cause is real The relation between the cause and the effect is that of difference and non difference The cause itself assumes the shape of the effect In reality, both are real The milk itself changes into curds, the effect in the cause in the form of the cause or the śakti is accepted It established the relation of difference and non-difference between the cause and the effect [3]

Parināma has been divided into two kinds [4]

(i) Svarūpa parināma as of the sāmkhya system (ii) śakti-viksepa-laksana-parinām Nimbārkācārya admits the Brahma-Kāranavāda or the Brahmaśaktikāranavāda [5] According to him the Universe exists in the Brahman in unmanifest form or identical form or in the form of potency (śakti) because it becomes

1 Ibid , 1 4, 25
2 Ghate, V S , The Vedānta, p 28, Poona, 1960
3 Joshi, Rasik Vihari, "The Role of Indian Logic in the Doctrine of Causality", Melangs D' Indianisme a la Mémoire De Louis Renou, Paris, 1968
4 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 1 26, p 169
5 Vedānta-Pārijāta-saurabha, 1 4 26

manifested as before. In this view the relation between the universe and Brahman is that of difference—non-difference such as the case of gold and ornaments.[1]

Several objections may be raised against the causality of Brahman. The most important and very natural one is : why should Brahman who has all His desires eternally fulfilled create this universe ?[2]

To this question, Nimbārka replies : The creation of Brahman is the mere sport, just like, the mere sport of kings. In ordinary life, the play of an emperor, who has attained sovereignty, with various kinds of dice, wooden balls, etc. is a mere sport without any desire for fruit, so Brahman creates the world in mere sport without any need.[3]

The second objection, which leads to the above, is no less natural. If the Lord creates this universe in mere sport, then why is there unequality in the universe ? Why is one rich and the other poor, one happy and the other unhappy, etc., why is it so ? It means the Lord is not all merciful, but is cruel.

Hence Nimbārka replies : Unequality and cruelty of unequal creation and destruction, etc. depend on the deeds of the Jīva, just as the cloud in producing different kinds of shoots depends on their respective seeds. So the śruti : "One becomes good by good deeds, bad by bad deeds." Thus, Brahman is not responsible for the miseries and various lots of Jīva. Jīva is itself responsible through its own deeds.[4]

It may be said that it is not just or right that Brahman should give the fruits of deeds in accordance with the deeds of Jīva, as there was no difference between Jīva and Brahman prior to creation. As declared by śruti, "The existent alone, my dear,

---

1 Joshi, Rasik Vihari : "The Role of Indian Logic in the Doctrine of Causality", Paris, 1968.

2 Vedānta-Pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 1. 31.

3 Ibid., 2. 1. 32.

4 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 1. 33.

was this in the beginning" So, unequality and cruelty of unequal creation depend on the Lord [1]

It is not so because the creation is beginningless He creates the universe *in accordance with the deeds of Jīva, which has* been done by the individual souls in the previous creation A subsequent creation cannot arise all of a sudden, so it depends on a prior creation It is clear from śruti "The creater formed the sun and moon as he did before," and so on [2]

One or two objections will be considered against this doctrine that Brahman is the creator of the world It is to be objected, Brahman is not the material cause of the universe, because there is difference between Brahman and the world Brahman possesses the attributes of sentience, while the world possesses just the opposite attributes of non sentience and it is the rule, whatever is different from something has not that for its material cause, just as the pot, which is different from the ether has not the ether as *its material cause* [3]

But Nimbārka points out, there is no rule that there will be a similarity between a material cause and its effect in every respect So it cannot be said that the world, being different from Brahmam, cannot arise from Him As sruti says "There is the origin of hairs on the head and so on from a person from whom they are *different, and of scorpions from the cowdung from which* they are different [4]"

An objection is raised Brahman is not the material cause of the world in dissolution, because, Brahman, the cause, like the effect, viz the world, will be non sentient [5]

The answer to this question is as follows Just as the evolutes like the pot, when dissolved, do not defile the lump of clay

---

1 Ibid, 2 1 34
2 Ibid, 2 1 34
3 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 1 4
4 Vedānta pārijāta saurabha, 2 1 6
5 Ibid, 2 1 8

with their own attributes, so this world, consisting of non-sentient, when dissolved into Brahman, does not defile Brahman, possessing the non-sentient as His power.[1]

It may be objected: Brahman is the material cause of the universe, then He Himself will experience the pleasures and pains in the form of Jīva, so that there will be no difference between the enjoyer (viz. the Jīva) and the controller.[2]

The answer to this is as follows: Just as, in ordinary life, though foams, waves and the rest, having the sea as their material cause, are all non-different from their respective causes, there is still a mutual difference amongst the particular effects themselves. In the same manner there may be a mutual difference between the enjoyer and the controller, although they are non-different from Brahman, having Brahman as their material cause. The fact, however, is, according to Nimbārka, that there is difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman.

Thus, we conclude that according to Nimbārka Brahman is both the material cause and the efficient cause of the universe and its soul. And Nimbārka, like that of the Sāṁkhya, is the upholder of Satkāryavāda.

The most important and natural question is raised. What is the proof of the existence of Brahman? The answer to this is as follows: Scripture alone is the source of knowing Brahman.[3]

5. DIFFERENCE BETWEEN JĪVA, JAGAT AND BRAHMAN

In the first place, there is difference of nature between Brahman on the one hand, the Jīva and the Jagat on the other. The mutual difference in the nature and concept of Jīva and Brahman is obvious. Brahman is the cause and Jīva his effect or transformation. There is a difference between the cause and its effect, as between the clay and the pots, dishes, etc., between the gold and the bracelets, ear-rings, etc., between the tree and

1 Ibid., 2. 1. 9.
2 Ibid., 2. 1. 13.
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 1. 3.

the leaves, fruits, etc , between the sea and the foams, waves, etc , and between the sun and its rays Similarly there is a difference between the Jīva (the enjoyer) and the Brahman (controller)[1]

And again, Nimbārka points out that there is difference between Jīva and Brahman as between the cause and the effect. He says that the creator of the world, viz , Brahman is something more than the embodied soul, the enjoyer of pleasure and pain, "On account of the indication of difference."[2] As in passage . "O ! the soul, indeed, should be seen", the knower of Brahman attains the highest, "Who controls the soul within "[3]

Moreover, just as in ordinary life, the diamond the lapis lazuli, the ruby and the rest, which are modification of the earth, are different from the earth , and the leaf and so on, which are modification of the tree, are different from tree , the ray of diamond is different from the diamond So, the Jiva which is modification of the Brahman, is different from Brahman[4]

There is a difference between Jīva and Brahman as between the part and the whole Jīva is the part of Brahman Brahman is the whole As declared by the śruti "For it is a part of the Highest A 'part' means a 'power', it is clear from sruti "The Jīva, a power of highest, is small in power and not independent.[5]"

The vedic mantra also confirms it The part idea comes from the puruṣasūkta, quoted in chāndogya upaniṣad (3 12 6)"pādo'sya viśvabhūtāni tripādasyāmṛtaṁ divi" (all the beings are His foot, immortal in the heaven is His three feet), A 'feet' means a part[6]

The smṛti also corroborates the concept of part thus "In

---

1 Ibid , 2 1 3
2 Adhikaṁ tu bhedanirdeśāt

—Brahmasūtra 2 1 21

3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 1 21.
4 Ibid , 2 1 22
5 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 3 42
6 Ibid , 2 3 43

this world of life the Jīva is My own part, in the form of eternal part." (*Gītā* 15.7).[1]

The relation of part and whole declares : that there is a difference between Jīva and Brahman, "On account of the designation of variety" i.e., on account of the designation of difference. The Jīva is, by nature, a part, and subject to bondage and salvation, while Brahman is, by nature, whole and the ocean of a mass of attributes like omniscience and the rest. The following are designation of difference : "Who rules the soul within ; having entered within, the ruler of men ; the soul indeed is supreme, self-dependent, possessing superior qualities, the Jīva is less powerful, dependent, lowest, the two unborn selves, the knower and the non-knower, the lord and the non-lord.[2]

The statement of difference (bheda) is expressed by Nimbārkācārya in Brahma-sūtra 1.1.18. The Jīva is different from Brahman, on account of the designation of difference.[3] Just as the vedic mantra : "He is indeed, the essence ; For indeed on attaining the essence, he becomes blissful." It designates a difference between Brahman as the object to be obtained, and the Jīva, as the obtainer, the obtainer cannot be the object to be obtained. Thus, there is a difference of nature between Jīva and Brahman, otherwise, an intermixture of attributes will result.[4] To prove this statement of difference, Nimbārkācārya says that the Jīva is not blissful but only Brahman, beeause Brahman is the cause of the bliss of Jīva[5] ; and the bliss of the Jīva is momentary, while the bliss of Brahman is endless.

Here a doubt arises that when Jīva and Brahman, both are conscious, both must be blissful. As śruti says "may my (sheaths)

1 Ibid., 2. 3. 44.
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 42.
3 Bhedavyapadeśācca

—Brahmasūtra 1. 1. 18.

4 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 1. 18.
5 Ibid., 1. 1. 15.

consisting of food, consisting of the vital-breath, consisting of the mind, consisting of understanding and consisting of bliss, be purified "[1] It is said that what consists of bliss is something to be purified , and as it is impossible for the ever-pure supreme soul to be something to be purified so that which consists of bliss is the Jīva

To this, the answer is as follows that blissful is Brahman alone, on account of repetition, viz the word 'bliss' has been repeated many times in scripture in reference to Brahman alone[2] So it is established that Jiva is different from Brahman, because on attaining him the Jīva comes to be united with bliss[3]

Who is within the sun, within the eye, and is to be worshipped by those who are desirous of salvation ? He is Brahman alone, not Jīva To prove this Nimbārkācārya explains "antastaddharmopadeśāt," that is, there is difference between Brahman and Jīva, because Brahman has special qualities such as He is free from all sins, He is the soul of all and so on.[4]

The statement of difference (bheda) is further expressed by Nimbārka in his commentary on Brahma-sūrta 1 1 22 'bheda-vyapadeśāccānyah' It means, by nature, Brahman is different from the individual souls of the sun and the rest, within which He dwells, on account of the designation of difference Again, it means that Brahman in Jiva, who is śarīrābhimānin, is different by nature It is also mentioned in the śruti "Who dwelling into the sun, is other than the sun, the sun does not know him, of whom the sun is the body, who controls the sun from within He is your soul, the inner controller, immortal " Thus, it is established that Brahman is different from Jīva within which He dwells[5]

"Sarvam khalvidaṁ brahma tajjālaniti śāntupāsīt" viz , "All

1 Vedānta kaustubha, 1 1 13
2 Vedānta-kaustubha, 1 1 13
3 Vedānta-pārijāta saurabha, 1 1 20
4 Ibid , 1 1 21
5 Ibid , 1 1 22

this, indeed, is Brahman, rising from him, disappearing into him and breathing in him ;—calm, one should meditate on him.[1]" For the purpose of meditation it is said that 'manomaya prāṇa śarīra', It means Brahman has a spiritual body and a vital-breath body. Here, it is understood, that for the purpose of meditation the spiritual body is Brahman alone, not Jīva. Because Brahman alone, celebrated in all the vedāntas, is referred to in the words, "sarvaṁ khalvidaṁ brahma."[2] It means that Brahman is different from Jīva.

To make this clear Nimbārka gives the evidences of śruti and smṛti. First of all he gives the evidence of Brahma-sūtra "Vivakṣīta guṇopapatteśca" and "anupapattestu na śārīraḥ". Both sūtras declare that Brahman is different from Jīva, "because of the appropriateness of the attributes intended to be stated"[3], and "on account of inappropriateness, not the embodied (soul)[4]." It means Brahman has the spiritual (manomaya) and vital-breath body, the form of light ; He has true volition, has the ether as the soul, has all desires, has all odours, has all tastes, etc., while Jīva has no spiritual body, and has not the above mentioned attributes such as : having all desires, having all odours, etc. "Karmakartavyapadeśācca" and "śabdaviśeṣāt" both sūtras of Braham-sūtra declare, too, that Brahman is different from Jīva "because of the designation of object and agent[5]" and "on account of the difference of words."[6] It means Brahman is object and the Jīva is agent. For instance: "Having departed from here, I shall attain him,"[7] in this sentence Brahman is object, while Jīva is an agent. And on account of difference in words, it is proved also that Jīva and Brahman are denoted by different words, viz., the genitive and the nominative respecti-

---

1 Chāndogyopainṣad, 3. 14. 1.
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 2. 1.
3 Ibid., 1. 2. 2.
4 Ibid., 1. 2. 3.
5 Ibid., 1. 2. 4.
6 Ibid., 1. 2. 5.
7 Chāndogyopaniṣad, 3. 14. 4.

vely. As in śruti "This my soul is into my heart "[1] In this sentence the mutual difference between Jīva and Brahman is obvious.

To conclude this statement of difference (bheda) Nimbārka further gives the evidence of smrti 'O Arjuna ! the Lord dwells in the heart of all beings.'[2] 'He who sees Me everywhere and sees everything in Me, of him I will never lose hold, and he shall never lose hold of me '[3] 'He, who established in unity worships Me abiding within all being', that yogin rests in Me whatever be his mode of living '[4] 'There is nothing higher than I, O Dhanañjaya' all this threaded in Me as rows of gems in a string '[5] 'Since I excel the perishable, and am more good than the imperishable, I am renowned in the world, and in the Veda as the supreme person (purusottam) [6], All these above evidences establish the mutual difference between Jīva and Brahman

There is difference between Jīva and Brahman. Brahman is ever-free from all sins, while Jīva is an enjoyer of the fruits of the deeds done by itself [7] Scripture is the sole proof Such as "Of these, he who is the supreme self is called to be eternal and devoid of all properties of matter. He is not smeared even by the fruit as a lotus leaf is not touched by water, the activeself, on the other hand, is another, who is liable to release and bondage[8] " Thus, it is established that Jīva is an enjoyer of the fruits of the deeds, while Brahman is ever-free from all sins.

Brahman is an eater who is destroyer of world, while the movable and the immovable are food which have death for their condiment It declares that Brahman is different from Jiva. As

1 Chāndogyopanisad, 3 14 3
2 Gītā, 18 61
3 Ibid , 6 30
4 Ibid , 6 31
5 Ibid , 7 7
6 Ibid., 15 18.
7 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 2 8
8 Ibid , 1. 2 8

śruti: "He to whom both the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya are the food and death the condiment, who thus knows where He is ?[1]

"ṛtaṁ pibantau sukratasya loke guhā praviṣṭau."[2] Here it is understood that there are two sentients, viz., Jīva and Supremeself into the cave, where the mutual difference is obvious between Jīva and Brahman. Brahman is difficult to see, who is hidden by yoga-māyā, who is all-pervasive, who has entered into the cave ; while Jīva who arises with the vital-breath, who is aditi, who is made of the deities, who was manifested' through the elements, who has entered into the cave.[3] To prove this, Nimbārka points out that Brahman is the object to be worshipped[4] and the object to be known[5] ; while Jīva is worshipper[6] and knower[7]. The mutual difference is obvious between them.

Brahman is the inner-controller, while Jīva is not the inner-controller because both the kānvas as well as Mādhyandinas depict Jīva as different from the inner-controller, viz., Brahman. As śruti : "He who is dwelling in intelligence" and "he who is dwelling in the soul.[8]

Brahman is imparishable and the source of beings, while Jīva is not denoted by the words 'imperishable' and the source of beings. So, there is difference between Jīva and Brahman, on account of attributes and difference. As śruti says, the designation of attributes is "All-pervading" and the designation of difference is "Higher than high imperishable."[9] The statement of difference (bheda) is expressed by Nimbārka in Brahmasūtra 1.3.5., "bhedavyapadeśācca". It means, Jīva cannot be the

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 2. 9.
2 Kathopaniṣad, 3. 1. 3, 2. 1. 7, 1. 2. 12.
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 2. 11.
4 Ibid., 1. 2. 12. .
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid., 1. 2. 21.
9 Ibid., 1. 2. 23.

heaven, the earth and the rest, on account of the designation of difference, viz., "there is difference between the Jīva which has little knowledge, and is subject to bondage and salvation through Lord's Māyā consisting of the three guṇas. and the Brahman who is the omniscient Lord. It establishes that there is difference between Jīva and Brahman as the knower and the object to be known.[1]

Regarding the relation of Jīva and Brahman, it is explained that, Brahman is non-eater, while Jīva is an eater.[2] As declared by the śruti : "of these two, one tastes the sweet berry, the other looks on without eating."[3]

Jīva and Brahman are different from each other. Brahman is the omniscient, while Jīva is non-knower in deep sleep.[4] As in śruti : "Embraced by the intelligent soul, he does not know anything eternal, nor anything internal."[5]

There is indeed difference between Jīva and Brahman on account of words like 'lord' and the rest, i.e.[6] On account of śruti like : 'He is Lord of all', 'the controller of all', 'The ruler of all', 'He rules all this', 'The Lord of all' etc.

Jīva is alone, that is subject to deeds and participates in imperfections, but Brahman is not subject to deeds. It is said by śruti : "The two birds of handsome plumage, close friends cling to the same tree. One of them eats the sweet berry, while the other, without eating looks on." It means, Jīva is an enjoyer on account of its imperfections, while Brahman is not touched even by an odour of imperfection, and He is not the enjoyer of the names and the forms to be created by Himself.[7]

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 3. 5.
2 Ibid., 1. 3. 7.
3 Muṇḍakopaniṣad, 1. 1. 3.
4 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 3. 43.
5 Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, 4. 3. 21.
6 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 3. 44.
7 Ibid., 3. 2. 13-14.

Thus, Baddha Jīva is entirely different from Brahman, being imperfect, sinful, impure and so on.

(B) There is difference between Jīva and Brahman in bondage as well as in salvation. Mukta Jīva is different from Brahman in two respects. In the first place, the freed-soul is atomic in size, while Brahman is all-pervading. Atomic Jīva cannot become all-pervasive in salvation. But it can take place in several bodies through its attributes of knowledge, as the case of a lamp, though placed in one place, pervades many places through its ray.[1] As scripture shows : 'the individual soul is as subtle as a hair point divided and sub-divided hundreds of times. He is potentially infinite. He has to be known.[2]'

In the second place, the freed soul, though similar to the Highest Brahman, yet cannot possibly be the lord of all the sentient and the non-sentient, their controller, their supporter, all-pervasive, and so on ; and hence its lordship is exclusive of the activities in connection with the universe.[3]

Thus, it is established that Jīva is not absolutely different from Brahman like the Mādhva-philosophy, but the mutual difference between Jīva and Brahman is equally eternal, natural, and undeniable, in bondage as well as in salvation. In the very same manner, the mutual difference in the nature and concept of 'Jagat' and Brahman is obvious. Brahman is the cause and the Jagat is its effect. The cause and the effect cannot be absolutely non-different.[4] Brahman is of the nature of all-pervading, omniscient, and non-gross, while the Jagat is inanimate and gross.[5]

Thus, the mutual difference of the three is distinctly established.

---

1 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 4. 4. 15.
2 Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, 5.9.
3 Ibid.
4 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 1. 16.
5 Ibid., 2. 1. 4.

6 NON-DIFFERENCE BETWEEN JIVA, JAGAT AND BRAHMAN

In reality, there is mutual non-difference between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman as between the cause (or the Whole) and the effect (or the part) Because, Brahman is the cause (or the whole) of the Jagat, and Jīva , and Jīva and Jagat are as effects and the parts of Brahman. Nimbārkācārya points out that there is non-difference between the cause and the effect and not absolute difference , On account of the texts[1] of the śruti, the smṛti and the sūtras In texts . "The effect, having its beginning in speech, is a name, the reality is just the clay,'the existence alone my dear, was this in the beginning one, without a second', 'He thought, may I be many , may I procreate', 'He created the light ; 'All that has this for its soul', 'that is true' 'that is soul', 'thou art that', 'All this, verily, is Brahman, emanating from Him, disappearing into Him and breathing in Him , 'that was unmanifest then' 'it became manifest by name and form' and so on"[2]

For this also, says Nimbārka, there is non-difference between the cause and the effect, because the effect is perceived only when the cause is existent[3]

Again he says, the effect which belongs to a posterior time is present in the cause. So the effect is non-different from the cause As declared by the śruti, "Brahman, indeed, was this in beginning.[4]"

Further, he makes it clear that it cannot be said that the effect does not exist prior to creation, on account of the designation of what is non-existent, as in the text "The non-existent, indeed, was this in the beginning " Because, the pre-existence of the effect is known from the complementary passage, viz , "That was existent "[5] And he again says, the pre-existence of the effect is known from reasoning He admits that the names,

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 1. 14
2 Ibid
3 Ibid , 2 1. 15
4 Ibid , 2 1. 16
5 Ibid , 2 1. 17.

forms, knowable by means of the evidence of direct perception and the rest; all are real, on account of being perceived. An agent, viz. a potter, makes a pot out of a lump of clay, that is existent. Here, like the lump of clay, the existence of the pot, too, is known from direct perception. Hence the activity of the agent, too, is not useless. Here, it cannot be said that as the pot already exists, like the lump of clay, the activity of the agent has no meaning. Because, the pot which was unmanifest before is made manifest. Hence the activity of the agent is not useless. The names and forms, mentioned in the Veda, are used just as they were before. Thus, according to Nimbārka, the conventional usage of names and forms is not unprecedented. On the other hand, Nimbārka says that the origin of a non-existent effect does not fit in, since the origin of a barely sprout from fire is never seen. It cannot be said that although fire has no power of producing such an effect, it has, none-theless, the power of producing sparks—for, in an effect produced from gold and the rest of a known weight, a different weight is never found. Likewise the sparks of fire, which are its evolutes and known through the evidence of direct perception, are perceived by all, there being no evidence for the imaginary doctrine of a power producing unprecedented objects. Hence, the doctrine of a non-existent effect (Asatkārya-vāda) is unreasonable.[1] Nimbārka states once more another reason for the existence of the effect, thus: the other text is the text aptly teaching the pre-existence of the effect: viz., "The existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning."[2]

The above-mentioned doctrine of existent effect (satkārya-vāda) is explained by the following illustrations. Such as: just as a piece of rolled up cloth, although not known to be a piece of cloth, does not, for that reason, become non-existent, but is indeed existent, existing in a different form, and when spread out one more, is known to be a piece of cloth; just as the drawn forth limbs of a tortoise are not perceived, even though existent, but

---

1 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 2. 1. 17.

2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 1. 17.

do not become non-existent thereby and are known when stretched out again ; just as the banyan tree, existent in the seed at all times indeed in a subtle form, is manifested in a gross form[1], and just as the vital-breath, having the prāna, apāna and the rest, controlled by breath exercise, etc. remains in its real form , and when the control removed, is instantly known in those respective forms,[2] so indeed prior to creation the universe remains existent indeed, though not known to be a universe, having its name and form unmanifest ; and is clearly known as the universe at the time of creation, having its name and forms manifest[3] Thus, the cause and the effect are non-different Because, the effect which belongs to posterior time, is present in the cause. Thus, it is established that the effect (or the part) is non different from the cause (or the whole) Similarly, the Jīva and the Jagat-the effects and the parts of Brahman, are non-different from Brahman the cause and the whole

The non-difference between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman is further supported and expressed by Nimbārkācārya in the verse of Vedānta-kāmadhenu that all things are "Brahmātmaka"[4] This statement (brahmātmaka) indicates the non-difference of the three Three, means there are three realities, viz , Brahman, Jīva and the Jagat So, having Brahman for their essence (brahmātmaka), Jiva and Jagat are non-different from Brahman, as the ear-ring is different from the bracelet in name and shape simply on account of kundalattva and kattakatva, but it is also non different so far as gold is concerned

Nevertheless, the authorities of śruti prove that Jiva and Jagat are non different from Brahman "Existence alone my dear, was this in the beginning one only, 'without a second',

1 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 1 18
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 1 18
3 Vedanta-kaustubha, 2 1 18
4 Sarvam hi vijñānamato yathārthakam /
śrutismrtibhyo nikhilasya vastunah //
Brahmātmakatvādíti vedavinmatam /
Trirupatāpi śrutisūtrasādhitā //

'This one only was soul in the beginning', 'Thou art that', 'This soul is Brahman', 'That I am Brahman', 'All this is, indeed, soul', 'all this is Brahman', I am you, indeed, revered deity,'[1] 'All this is, verily Brahman for therefrom does it proceed, therein does it merge, and thereby it is maintained.'[2]

To prove this statement of non-difference, another ground is as follows :

There is non-difference between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman because the existence and activity of Jīva and Jagat depend on Brahman (tadāyattasthitipravṛtikatvāt).[3] As is clear from śruti : "The lord abides, O Arjuna ! in the heart-region of all, causing all beings to revolve by his mysterious power, as if mounted on a machine." Moreover, whatever is dependent on something else for its existence and activity, involves or implies non-difference. It is said in the dialogue between the vital-air and the sense organs in the Chāndogya : "Verily they are not called speech, eyes, or mind, but the vital-breath called alone.[4]

To make this statement of non-difference clear, the final ground is as follows : Jīva and the Jagat are non-different from Brahman, because they are pervaded by Brahman (tadvyāpya).[5] Whatever is seen or heard in this world, internal or external, that all is pervaded by Nārāyaṇa.

7. SVABHAVIKA-BHEDABHEDA-VADA

Having thus observed the difference between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman ; and non-difference between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman, let us now explain "Svābhāvika-bhedābheda-vāda" between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman.

1 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 89.
—Vedānta-Kāmadhenu, Verse 7

2 Gītā, 18.61.

3 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 89.

4 Chāndogyopaniṣad, 5. 1. 15.

5 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 89.

The relation between Brahman, on the one hand and the Jīva and the Jagat on the other, is the relation of natural difference and non-difference (Svābhāvika-bhedābheda-vāda) The natural relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman is explained by Nimbārkācārya in such a sūtra of Brahmasūtra as "aṁśo nānāvyapadeśādanyathācāpi dāśakitavāditvamadhīyata eka" The Jīva *is neither absolutely different* from the Brahman, nor absolutely non-different from him, but it is a part of Brahman, and the Brahman is the whole of the Jīva Here, 'a part' means a 'power' It should not be understood here as a portion like a portion of wealth, there will result an absolute difference between Jīva and Brahman, and hence the texts like, "Thou art that" will be set aside. So, the true doctrine is that *there is a natural relation of* difference and non difference between Jīva and Brahman Thus, *the Jīva is by nature different* from Brahman predicated to be the whole and the store of attributes like omniscient and the rest while it is predicated to be a part, as is subject to bondage and salvation But it is yet non-different from Brahman, as its existence and activity are under control of the whole There is a natural difference and non-difference between the Jīva and Brahman, "On account of the designation of variety and *otherwise*" *viz on account of the* designation of difference and non-difference The following are designations of difference "Who controls the individual self within," 'Having entered within, the ruler of the people,' 'The soul' indeed is independent and possessed of more qualities, Jīva is less powerful, is dependent and is lowly,' the two unborn ones, the knower and the non- knower, *the lord and the non-lord*' *and* so on The *following are designations of non-difference* 'Thou art that', 'this ātman is Brahman', 'I am Brahman' and so on[2]

On the other hand, there is a natural relation of difference *and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman in* salvation too Thus the freed Jiva is entirely non-different from the Brahman, being existence cognition-bliss in essence (saccidānandasvarūpa)

1 Brahmasūtra, 2 3. 42

2 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 3 42

But the freed Jīva, too, is different from the Brahman in two respects. In the first place the freed Jīva is atomic in size, while Brahman is all pervasive. And in the second place, the freed Jīva, though similar to the Brahman, yet cannot possibly be the lord of all the sentient and the non-sentient, their creator, their supporter, their destroyer, all-pervasive and so on, which Brahman possesses fully and eternally. Thus, it is established that there is natural relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman in salvation.

The conclusion arrived at, therefore, is that there is natural relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman in bondage as well as in salvation. It is further supported by Śrīnivāsācārya, according to whom the fact is that even during the bondage (baddhāvasthā) the Jīva, which is atomic in size and possesses little knowledge, though different from Brahman, who is all-pervading, non-straying in nature and omniscient, yet like the leaf from the tree, the ray from the lamp, quality from the qualified, sense organs from the vital-air, its existence and activities being dependent upon the Brahman, is non-different from the Brahman. Likewise though in salvation (muktāvasthā) the Jīva is non-different from Brahman, it having no separate independent existence and activity, at the same time, it is undoubtedly different from Brahman, in accordance with the śruti "svena rupena sampadyate"—"It realizes its own nature." Otherwise the nature of both—the Jīva and the Brahman, becomes loose.[1]

In the very same manner, there is the relation of difference and non-difference between Jagat and Brahman. Brahman is of the nature of the all-pervading, non-gross, omniscient, while the Jagat is inanimate and gross. Thus, the mutual difference of the Jagat and Brahman is distinctly established. The doctrine of non-difference between the Jagat and Brahman is explained by the illustration of the ornaments. The ear-ring is different from the bracelet in name and shape simply on

1 Vedānta-kaustubha, 1. 4. 21.

account of kuṇḍalattva and kaṭakattva, but is also non-different so far as gold is concerned

To conclude the present doctrine of natural difference and non-difference (svābhāvikabhedābhedavāda), I will give the final evidence of Brahmasūtra, which is as follows Ubhayavyapadeśā ahikuṇḍalavat[1]" Which means "But on account of the designation of both, like the case of serpent and its coil". All the corporeal and incorporeal entities of the universe, being different from Brahman, are also non-different on account of the designation of both difference and non-difference In the present illustration "ahikuṇḍalavat", the serpent is the material cause of the coil. The serpent is independent while the coil is dependent On one side, this proves the difference between the serpent and its coil On the other, the existence and activity of coil is impossible in the absence of the serpent It proves the non-difference between the serpent and its coil Likewise the universe is the effect or transformation of the Brahman The relation of the universe—the effect with the Brahman—the cause, is natural difference and non-difference (svābhāvikabhedābhedavāda)[2]

CONCLUSION

What is the exact relation between these three realities, viz, Jīva, Jagat and the Brahman? This is a very important philosophical problem and hundreds of views have been advanced on this point This cannot be easily brought under any well known logical category such as identity, difference, and difference and non-difference

On one hand, we have strict non-dualistic doctrines, such as "Advaitavāda' of Śankara, and the 'Suddhādvaita' of Vallabha, in which Jīva and Jagat are completely identical with Brahman, and on the other hand, we have strict dualistic doctrines, such as 'Dvaita-Vāda' of Madhva, in which Jīva and Jagat are completely different from Brahman

And again, we see the doctrine of Nimbārka, Rāmānuja,

1 Brahmasūtra, 3 2 27

2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 3 2 27.

Bhāskara, Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya, Śrīkaṇṭha and Śrīpati. All of them accept the relation of both difference and non-difference between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman, to be equally real ; but all of them try to reconcile them in different ways. Nimbārka accepts the relation of both difference and non-difference between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman, which is to be equally natural (svābhāvika) and completely compatible. Rāmānuja and Śrīkantha explain the relation of Jīva, Jagat and Brahman on the analogy of soul and body (śarīrī-śarīra) in which non-difference is the principal ; it is qualified by difference, which is thus subordinate to it. Bhāskara regards the difference and non-difference to be equally real but he takes difference to be aupādhika and non-difference to be natural and real. Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya regards the difference and non-difference as inconceiveable (acintya). Śrīpati regards the difference and non-difference to be equally natural but he takes that identity is not only natural but also of form.

But considering the above doctrines, Nimbārka's main contribution seems to be very reasonable, both from the philosophical and theological points of view. Nimbārka elucidates his point about the relation between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman, by the analogy of the cause and the effect (or the part and the whole relation), as we have observed. The effect (or the part) is different from its cause (or the whole) in attributes and powers, forms and functions. A clay-jar, for example, is different from lump of clay, in this sense that the lump has a round shape ; the jar a oblong one, the lump is black ; the jar, brown, the lump is soft ; the jar, hard ; we can besmear the floor with the lump, but cannot fetch water by it, and so on. But, on the other hand, the effect is also non-different from the cause, in essence, being but its transformation ; for example, a clay-jar, an effect, is non-different from the lump of clay—the cause, in essence, both being equally clay.

Hence, the relation between the cause and its effects (or the part and the whole) to neither one of pure non-difference (abheda) nor one of pure difference (bheda) one of natural difference and non-difference (svābhāvikabhedābheda), both of which are equally real.

The very same is the case with Jīva, Jagat and Brahman The Jīva, Jagat are the effects (or the parts) of the Brahman, and the Brahman is the cause (or the whole of the Jīva and Jagat The mutual difference between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman is obvious As we have already observed that Brahman is of the nature of all pervading, omniscient and independent, while Jīva is knowing little and dependent on Brahman, and so on Jagat is inanimate and gross But on the other hand, Jīva, Jagat are also non-different from Brahman, because these are after all nothing but Brahman To conclude this present note, it may be illustrated by well known example of Brahmasūtra' which is 'ahikuṇḍalavat' In this present illustration 'ahikuṇḍalavat' the serpent is the cause of the coil and the coil is the effect of the serpent The serpent is independent, while the coil is dependent On the one hand, it shows the difference between the serpent and its coil On the other hand, the existence and activity of coil is impossible in the absence of the serpent It shows the non-difference of the serpent and its coil Likewise, the relation of Jīva, Jagat-the effect (or the parts, transformation), with the Brahman-the cause (or the whole), is natural difference and non-difference (svābhāvikabhedābheda)

Thus, we see that there is relation of both difference and non-difference between Jīva, Jagat and Brahman The testimony of various scriptures proves the natural difference and non-difference of Jīva, Jagat with Brahman. There is no such-contradiction, in the doctrine of natural difference and non-difference (svābhāvikabhedābhedavāda) of Śrīnimbārkārcārya, as we find in some vedāntic-system, such as the follower of 'dvaitavāda', has to accept many texts like "Sarvaṁ khalvidaṁ Brahma" as subordinate ones , and the followers of 'Advaitavāda', have to accept many texts which determine difference, as subordinate ones '

However, Nimbārka's very special contribution seems as regards the relation of Jīva, Jagat and Brahman, to be very reasonable So, even now, Nimbārka school has a best place and a great importance in Indian-devotees

PART II

Relation of Jīva and Brahman

1

THE CONCEPT OF RELATION

I DEFINITION OF RELATION

Everything is decided to be true or false on the basis of direct experiences alone Philosophy primarily explains different kinds of experiences Every experience involves some kind of relation Relation determines cognition which is of experiences Determinate experiences are made possible by relation An abstract entity, has no relation to anything Relation denotes facts Hence, relation plays a very important role in our knowledge

Every relation implies two terms viz , Pratiyogin (counter-correlative) and anuyogin (correlated substratum) Pratiyogin is that which rests on a substratum and anuyogin is substratum

In the Buddhist-philosophy, relations are contingent reality, that is to say no ultimate reality at all Ultimate reality is unrelated, it is non-relative, it is the absolute Relations are constructions of our imagination, they are nothing actual The Indian realists, however kept to the principle that relations are as real as the things and that they are perceived through the senses Udyotakara says ' the perception of the connection of an object with its mark is the first act of sense-perception from which inference proceeds ' According to him connection is perceived by the senses as well as the connected facts

Dharmakīrti in the first stanza of his work "Sambandha—Parīkṣā states that conjunction or relation necessarily means dependence Therefore "all relations in the sense of ultimate (or independent) reality do not really exist" Vinītadeva, in another subcomment, states that the expressions "related to another", "dependent on another", "supported by another", "sub-

ject to another's will" are convertible. Causality, contact, Inherence and opposition are not realities by themselves. There are no "Possessors" of these relations otherwise than in imagination. A reality is always one reality. It cannot be single and double at the same time. Vācaspatimiśra quotes a Buddhist who remarks that these relations considered as objective realities are, as it were, unfair dealers who buy goods without ever paying any equivalent. They indeed pretend to acquire perceptiveness, but possess no shape of their own which they could deliver to consciousness as a price for the acquisition of that perceptiveness. If a thing is a separate unity it must have a separate shape which it imparts to consciousness in the way of producing a representation. But relation has no shape apart from the things related. Therefore, says Vinītadeva, a relation in the sense of dependence cannot be something objectively real. Neither, can a relation be partially real, because to be partially real means nothing but to be real and non-real at the same time, because reality has no parts what has parts can be real empirically, (but not ultimately).

Keśavamiśra defines the relation as follows[2] : "Sambandho hi 1. sambandhibhyāṁ bhinnaḥ, 2. ubhayāśritaḥ, 3. ekaśca, viz., the relation (sambandha) should be different from the relatas (sambandhibhyāṁ), dependent on both, and one. As for example, the conjunction of a kettle-drum and the stick. The conjunction (saṁyoga-sambandha) is different from the kettle-drum and the stick because the kettle-drum and the stick are substances (dravya) and the conjunction is a quality (guṇa), dependent on both, and is one.

According to Naiyāyikas a relation is perceived. Vātsyāyana[3]

1 Th. Stcherbatsky, "Buddhist-Logic", Vol. I, pp. 246-248.

2 (a) Tarka-bhāṣā of Keśavamiśra, Ed. Ācārya Viśveśwara, p. 122, Benares, 1963.

(b) Sambandhibhinnatve sati sambandhyāśritaḥ-Nyāyakośa of Jhalkikar Bhimacarya, p. 920. Poona, 1928.

3 Vātsyāyana-Bhāṣya on Nyāya-Sūtra 1.1.5, p. 16, Poona, 1939.

says that, a relation is seen, i.e., perceived. Similarly, Viśvanātha says that the conjunction is an object of the eye[1] and the perception of inherence is due to the relation of attributiveness.[2]

Like Naiyāyikas, Mīmānsakas maintain that relation is perceived.[3] Kumārila Bhaṭṭa in his "Ślokavārtika" in the interpretation of the words "Jñāta-sambandhasya," says that once a permanent relation whether it be a case of co-existence (as in the case of the contiguity of the constellation of krittikā with Rohiṇī, where, by the rise of the former the early rise of the latter may be inferred), or a case of identity (as in the relation between a genus and its species), or a case of cause and effect or otherwise between two things and a third thing which had been apprehended in a large number of cases is perceived.[4] Sucāritamiśra in his commentary on 'Ślokavārtika' namely "Kāśikā" says that for this purpose that relation is perceived, it is said in Ślokavārtika "yadavastu lokaḥ pratipadyatesmin dvidhāpi tat śakyat eva vaktumiti.[5]

In Śaṅkrite Advaita philosophy, all relations are purely conceptual and superimposed. Because Śaṅkara admits that the real-existence (pāramārthikasattā) is one. That is merely real. But the phenomenon world is vyāvahārika, which is illusory. In this sense, all relations do not possess any reality from the transcendental standpoint. So, relations as the cause and the effect etc. are known as vivarta (illusory).

---

1 *Kārikāvali of Viśvanāth, Ed. Sarma Srichandrahari Singh*, Verse 54, p. 97, Darabhanga, 1939.

2 (a) Ibid., V., 61, p. 108.
(b) Bhattacarya, Tara Sankara "Relation *according to the* New-school *of* India Logic (Navya-Nyāya)", *Journal of the* Ganganath Jha Research Institute, Allahabad, vol. II, pt. 4, 1945, p. 392.

3 Śābara-Bhāṣya, 1.1.5

4 (a) Ślokavārtika on anumāna.
(b) Dasgupta, S N., "History of Indian Philosophy", Vol. I, p. 387, Cambridge, 1922.

5 Mīmānsāślokavārtika of Kumārilabhaṭṭa with the commentory 'Kāśikā' of Sucāritamiśra, Part III, p. 100, Trivandrum, 1943.

According to the Śaivas, the entire manifestation, whether subjective or objective is due to the will of the universal self. Relation is nothing but a special category based on the general category-unity in multiplicity-involving two external Realities. Because both the material and the subject that works on it are the manifestations of the ultimate, the relation, therefore, naturally does not end with the individual self, but ultimately depends upon the universal self.[1]

Some vedāntic-schools such as of Bhāskara, Rāmānuja, Nimbārka etc., to establish the truth of the proposition that relations are real, recognize that each existence has a twofold aspect : one its causal state and the other its effected state. As for example, " 'the pot' and 'the dish' etc. and the clay. The 'pot' is different from dish in nature and shape, but there is also non-difference so far as, the clay is concerned. They are thus both different and non-different from each other." In this manner, the reality of non-difference is not the least lower than the reality of difference. Thus all relations are real.

2. TYPES OF RELATION

There is an indefinite number of relations in Indian philosophy. According to Naiyāyikas, principal relations are conjunction and inherence (saṁyoga and samavāya). Saṁyoga is defined

---

1 (a) Na kevalaṁ ca sambandhamayaikatāsparśiparimitamāyāpramātraparyavasāyi vastuprakāśanavyāparah yāvadanantcinmayaśivātāvabhāsaviśrāntaiva pratikṣaṇaṁ vastusamvitkriyā/

Na ca samvidaḥ kramosti ekaivaikatraiva kṣaṇerthaprakāśanāt /

Śaiva sambandhaśivatāmayameva svarūpamāviskarotityucyat //

—Sambandhasiddhi of Utapaladeva, p. 9, Srinagar, 1921.

(b) Pandey, Dr. K. C., "Bhāskarī", Vol. I, Introduction, p. XXIII, Ed. by Iyer and Pandey, Allahabad, 1938.

(c) Iyer and Pandey, "Śaiva Theory of Relation", Allahabad, 1938, p. 17.

as the contact of two things that were first separate, and therefore there can be no saṁyoga between two all pervading things which are never apart from each other[2], for example, the tree is perceived through conjunction with the eye Samavāya means an intimate or inseparable relation The blue colour cannot be separated from the blue lotus Annambhatta[3] defines the Samavāya as an intimate relation between two things which are technically called 'ayuta-siddha' 'Ayuta-siddha means those things which have never existed in a separate condition without themselves being destroved, are 'avuta-siddha'. These 'ayuta siddha' things are limited in number, such as 1 The component parts and composite whole (avayava and avayavin), 2 The quality and the qualified (guna and gunin), 3 The motion and the moving (kriyā and kriyāvāna), 4 The individual and the common characteristic (jāti and vyakti), the lastly 5 particularity and eternal substance (Viśesa and nityadravya)

Although in all these cases here it is a question of different aspects of the problem of the one and multiple, these five types of Samavāya do not seem to the Mādhva to correspond the question on the same order. Some of them aim at the relationship between substance and attribute of the dharmin to the multiple dharma, the others want to give account of the plurality of the substance, separated one from the others, and yet in relation one with the other These two orders of the problem are considered in a distinct way by Mādhva One is contented in the notion of the Viśiṣta, all concrete and specified, the others

1 aprāptayostu yā prāptih saiva samyoga īritah/
—Bhāsā-pariccheda by Viśvanāth Pancānana, Ed and translated by D. E Roer (Bibliotheca Indica) p 114

2 Tarka sangraha of Annambhatta, Ed and translated by Y V Athalye and M R Bodas, pp 164-165, Poona, 1963

3 Nitya-sambandhah samavāyah, ayutasiddhavrattiḥ /
yayordvayormadhye ekamavinasyadaparasritamevavatisthate tavayutasiddhau /
avayavāvayavinau, gunaguṇinau, kriyākriyāvantau, jātivyaktī, Visesanitvadravyaceti /
—Tarka Sangraha of Annambhaṭṭa, Kāśī, pp 130-131, 1939

implicate the imagination of the notion of bheda, difference which separaties these realities and divides them one from the others.

In the place of Samavāya, the Bhāṭṭa Mīmāmsakas and Advaitins recognize the relation of difference-cum-identity (tādātmya). The relation of tādātmya, according to Bhāṭṭas, is not absolute identity as the Naiyāyikas take it to be ; but it is identity in a relative sense i.e. identity (abheda) compatible with difference (bheda-sahiṣṇu). Though difference and identity are ordinary opposed to each other, yet they are taken by the Bhāttas to be compatible with each other, on the ground that it is experience, after all, that determines the compatibility or incompatibility of two things and that experience warrants the recognition of difference, associated with identity, as forming the relation between jāti and vyakti. In the proposition—'This is a horse' (ayam aśvaḥ), for instance, 'this' refers to a particular vyakti and 'horse', according to the Bhāttas, primarily refers to horseness (aśvatva), which is a jāti. According to this view in a judgement embodied in this proposition, a jāti is equated with a vyakti : But this equation cannot be absolute as, in that case, the two words 'this' and 'horse' would turn out to be synonyms. Therefore, the Bhāttas argue that, on the strength of what is presented in cognition, a particular relation consisting in differ-

---

1 Siauve, Suzanne, 'La Doctrine de MADHVA', p. 173, Institut Franc, ais d' indologie, Pondichery, 1968 :

"Bien qu'il s' agis dans toust ces cas d' aspects différents du probléme de l 'un et du multiple, ces cinq types de samavāya ne semblent pas aux mādhva correspondre ā des questions de même ordre. Les unes visent le rapport de la substance á ses attributs, du dharmin unique á ses dharma multiples, les, autres entendent rendre compte de la pluralité des substances, séparées les unes and autres, et cependant en relation les unes avec les autres. Ces deux ordees de problémes sont envisagés de facon distincte par les Mādhva L'un est contenu dans la notion de viśiṣṭa, tout concret et specifié, l 'autre implique l 'examen de la notion de bheda, différence qui sépare ces réalités et les divise les unes des autres."

ence-cum-identity (bhedābhedau), should be recognized in the case of Jāti and vyakti

In the philosophy of Nimbārka, the relation always presupposes difference and non difference (bhedābheda) When we say that the universe is non-different from Brahman, we do not mean thereby that non-difference means 'absolute identity' but simply that the universe is absolutely dependent on Brahman, which can have no existence and activity independently of him, "Just as the thousand-rayed sun, having independent existance and activity in contrast to its own rays, is their soul and the rays are non-different from it "[2] Thus, non difference here means essential dependence and not absolute identity The relation of identity is possible between two things when they are non-different in some way or other No identity is possible between a cow and a horse Again, identity is not possible in the case of a single horse also But there is a relation of identity between the effect and its cause, the attribute and its substratum, the power and its possessor, i e, only between two things which are both different and non-different, otherwise, in accordance with the text —"All this, verily, is Brahman", the universe, consisting of the sentient and the non-sentient must be non-different from Brahman in nature, which is impossible [2] Thus, non-difference is of this kind which is not inconflict with difference,[3] but is compatible with difference [4] And, difference means difference of nature Thus, difference and non difference (bhedābheda)

---

1 Shastri, S Kuppuswami, 'A Primer of Indian Logic', pp 30-31, Madras, 1951

2 "Vedānta-pārijāta-Saurabha and Vedānta kaustubha", English Translation by Roma Bose, Vol II, p 785, 4 1 3, Calcutta, 1943

3 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 4 1 3

4 (a) Vedānta-ratna-mañjūsā, p 91, Benares, 1907

(b) Tattavaprakāśikā of Keśava Kāśamīri, Commentary on Gītā, Hindi translation, Kalika Singh, p 102, Bardhawan, 1935

relation is equally real and compatible with each other. There is no contradiction between difference and non-difference.

An objection may be raised here that there is contradiction of co-existence (sāmānādhikaraṇyavyāghātaḥ) between the difference and non-difference (bhedābheda). The Naiyāyikas maintain that, non-difference amounts to a negation of difference, and difference invariably involves total exclusion of identity.[1] It is clear that there is contradiction of co-existence between difference and non-difference like the case of a jar and the negation of jar (ghata and ghatābhāva). And again, they say that non-difference (abheda) is merely identity and identity is in a relative sense, compatible with difference (bhedasahiṣṇuabheda). Thus, to explain the difference and non-difference (bhedābheda), the non-difference (abheda) is tenable but the difference (bheda) is futile.

To remove this objection Nimbārka school holds that, in the difference and non-difference (bhedābheda), difference as the total exclusion of identity is not tenable on account of all things having Brahman for their souls (brahmātmakatvát)[2]. So, the difference (bheda) is that, which is non-contradictory of having Brahman for their souls (brahmātmaka), is completion of different knowledge of the different things and different things caused to be done (tattadavastugatavailakṣaṇyapratitaḥ—vilakṣaṇa kāryakāritāyāśca nirvāhakaḥ), and is merely position (bhāva) or negation (abhāva). Again they say about the non-difference .(abheda) that non-difference is untenable, as defined that non-difference (abheda) is merely absolute negation of that difference, which invariably involves total exclusion of identity, because non-difference (abheda) is the relation of identity with Brahman only and, which is not contradictory of the difference (bheda) but is compatible with difference, as it has been already shown. Thus, non-difference (abheda) is the relation of identity

1 tādātmyasambandhāvachhinnapratiyogitākonyonyābhāvaḥ / —Tarkasangraha of Annambhaṭṭa, p. 133, Kāśī, 1939.

2 Vedānta-kāmadhenu of Śrīnimbārkācārya, Verse 7.

with Brahman, and it is compatible with difference As for example, it is true that the ear-ring is non-different from the bracelet as the gold, but there is also difference so far as, in name and shape simply on account of kundalattva and katakattva It is true that there is non-difference between the sun and its rays so far as brightness is concerned, but actually there is also difference between the sun and its rays Thus, there is no contradiction of co-existence in the relation of difference and non-difference (bhedābhedasambandha) both are equally real and compatible.

The concept of relation of Bhedābheda may be illustrated by the well-known example of "the serpent and its coil" [1] The serpent is the material cause (upādānakārana) of the coil The serpent is independent while the coil is dependent On one side, this shows the difference between the serpent and its coil. On the other the existence and activity of coil is impossible in the absence of the serpent, it proves the non-difference of the two.

Hence, we may say that the relation of difference and non-difference is essentially an internal relation in the philosophy of Nimbārka Because in this system, difference is compatible with non difference, the causation is not new creation, but transformation to some extent like the Sāṁkhya-view, and all relations may be said to involve difference and non-difference in some sense

The above-discussed relation of difference and non-difference (Bhedābheda) may however exist between several types of things, as indicated by some illustrations, such as "the serpent and its coil",[2] 'the sun and its lustre",[3] and "An ocean consists of the water, waves, bubble etc. etc" Four types of relation of difference and non-difference (bhedābheda) are mentioned by

---

1 Vedanta-pārijāta-saurabha and Kaustubha, 3 2 27

2 Brahma-Sūtra, 3 2 27.

3 Ibid., 3 2 28

Sureśwarācārya[1] in his Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadabhāṣyavārtika. These are following :-

(i) Sāmānya and viśeṣa.
(ii) Avasthāvat and avasthā.
(iii) Kārya and Kāraṇa.
(iv) Bhāga and Bhāgin.

(*i*) *Sāmānya and Viṣeśa.* The universal and the corresponding particulars : as for example, 'horseness' and the several individual 'horses'. It refers to horseness (aśvatva), which is the universal (sāmānya), and to individuals 'horses', which are particulars. According to this view para-brahman would be the basic or in most principal revealing itself in all existent things the particulars and the apara-Brahman these existent things themselves.[2]

(*ii*) *Avasthāvat and avasthā.* Substance and its modes : as for instance, the waveless ocean manifests itself as waves, and bubbles and yet maintains its self-identity. In the same way, the parabrahman involves itself into the aparabrahman and yet is identical with itself.

(*iii*) *Kārya and Kāraṇa* : The cause and the effect : as for instance, 'threads' and 'cloth' (pata and tantu), threads are cause of cloth and cloth is the effect. Similarly, Brahman is the material cause of the universe, and the universe is the effect. The universe arises from the Brahman and returns to the Brahman, so that the two are neither altogether different nor the absolute non-different but both are different and non-different. Thus, it is established that there is the relation of difference and non-difference between the cause and the effect.

(*iv*) *Bhāga and Bhāgin.* The whole and the part : as for example, a 'chariot-wheel' and 'the nave of the chariot-wheel',

1 Bṛhadāraṇyakopanisadabhāṣyavārtikaṁ of Sureśwarācārya, pp. 623-624, St. 948-50, Ānandāśram Sanskrit Series, Bombay, 1893.

2 Hiriyāna, Prof. M., "Bhartṛprapañca—An Old Vedāntin" Proceedings and Transactions of Oriental Conference III, Madras, 1924.

'the circumference of a wheel' etc. The chariot-wheel is bhāgin (the whole) and its nave, the circumference etc, are the bhāgas (the parts) In the same way, the Brahman is the bhāgin (the whole) of the Jiva, and the Jīva is bhāga (part) of the Brahman

Prakāśātman maintains five types[1] of relation of difference and non-difference (bhedābheda) in his "pañcapadikavivaranam", instead of these above discussed four types These are following

(i) Jāti and vyakti
(ii) Guna and Gunin
(iii) Kārya and Karana
(iv) Viśiṣṭasvarūpa
(v) Aṁśa and Aṁśin

(*i*) *Jāti and vyakti* The general and particular as for example, blue and yellow etc things are naturally different in colour, but are non-different so far as substance is concerned The same is between Jīva and Brahman

(*ii*) *Guna and Gunin* The attribute and its substratum as for instance, "the table and the shape, colour etc of the table" Similarly, Brahman is substratum of the Universe and the sensient and non sentient universe is attribute of the Lord There is relation of difference and non-difference between the Lord and His attributes

(*iii*) *Karya and Karana* The cause and the effect as for example "the clay and the pot" Similarly, Jiva is effect of the Brahman and Brahman is the cause of the Jiva So, Jīva is different and non-different from Brahman, as the cause and the effect

(*iv*) *Viśistasvarupa* The special form as for example, 'the clay and the pot, dishes' etc 'The clay takes a specialform

1 Na tāvajjātivyaktigunagunikāryakāranaviśiṣtasvarūpāmsāmsinbhāva nibandhanā /
Pañcapādikavivaranam of Prakāśatman, Vol III, Part II, p 259, Vizianagram Sanskrit series, 1892

(viśiṣtasvarūpa) such as the pot, dishes etc., in this sense the clay is different from the pot, dishes etc. But, on the other hand, the clay is non-different from the pot, dishes etc., because these forms are after all nothing but the clay. The same is between Jīva and Brahman. Brahman takes a special form (viśiṣtasvarūpa), when he becomes many, as Jıvas, in this sense Brahman is different from Jīvas. But, on the other-hand, the Brahman is non-different from Jīvas, because Jīvas are after all nothing but the Brahman.

(v) *Aṁśa and Aṁśin* : The whole and the part : as for example, 'the tree and the branches, leaves' etc. The same, Brahman is whole and Jīva is His part. There is relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman, as the whole and the part.

Having thus discussed the concept of relation, in the 3rd chapter we will see which type of relation of difference and non-difference (bhedābheda) is adopted by Śrīnimbārkācārya to establish his doctrine of Natural difference and non-difference (Svābhāvika-Bhedābheda).

2

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF DIFFERENCE AND NON-DIFFERENCE

The doctrine of difference and non-difference is not quite new Its tradition goes back to the vedic time The pre-Bādarāyana thinkers like Āśmarathya and Āuḍulomin offered the dualistic-cum-monistic interpretation of the upaniṣadic passages and are referred to as such in the Brahma-Sūtra Kāśakrtsna is interpreted by Sankara as an exponent of non dualism But Śrīnivāsa, an immediate disciple of Nimbārka, and Sripati Panditācārya think that Kāśakrtsna was, an exponent of the doctrine of difference and non-difference It shows that Kāśakrtsna was also an old exponent of the doctrine of difference and non-difference Even in the later ages Lakulīśa, Bhartṛprapañca, Bhāskara, and Yādavaprakāśa were the supporters of this doctrine And after that the doctrine of difference and non-difference is elaborated in the philosophy of Nimbārka, Srīkṛṣnacaitanya and Śrīpati Though, the doctrine of difference and non-difference of Āsmarathya, Āuḍulomin and Kāsakrtsna is known from references only , and the same doctrine of the philosophers—from Lakulisa to Yadavaprakāśa has been almost lost, yet the doctrine of difference and non difference of the Nimbārka, Srikrṣnacaitanya and Srīpati is living to this day Thus, the development of the

1 (i) Pandey, Dr K C, "Dualism-cum-Monism (Bhedābhedavāda)" Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, Allahabad, Vol XXXXI, pts 1-4, Nov , 1963—August, 1965, p 245

(ii) "Bhedābhedvādo vaidikaparamparāyāmapyupalabhyate/ Vaidikabhedābhedavādinoh' Āsmarathya', 'Āuḍulomin' matavorbādarāyanena sviyabrahmasūtre krata evopānyāsah /" "Saivadarśanabindu" of Pandey, Dr K C, p 54, Benares, Samvat 2021

doctrine of difference and non-difference may be discussed in three stages for convenience. First is that, which is known from references only, as the doctrine of Āśmarathya, Auḍulomin and Kāśakṛtsna, second is that which has been almost lost as the doctrine of the philosophers—from the Lakulīśa to Yādavaprakāśa and, third is that which is living to this day as the doctrine of difference and non-difference of Nimbārka, Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya and Śrīpati.

First Stage

1. *The Doctrine of Āśmarathya*[1]

As the sparks being the effects of the fire, are not absolutely different from the fire, because they participate in the nature of the fire, and, on the other hand, are not absolutely non-different from the fire, because in that case they could be distinguished neither from the fire nor from each other. So, Jīvas are neither different from Brahman for that would mean they are not of the nature of intelligence, nor absolutely non-different from it, since then, they would not be different from each other. Hence the Jīvas are different and non-different from Brahman.[2] And again, just as in the case of the pot and the clay, being the effect and cause, there is undoubtedly primary difference between them and on the other hand, there is non-difference between them, because the word 'pot' refers to the clay as well,[3] so, according to Āśmarathya, the Jīva is also the effect of Brahman, who is the cause of all, as the śruti says, "Yato va Imāni bhūtāni jāyante,"[4] "from whom, all these elements arise". Thus, these two are related as cause and effect. Being the effect and the cause there is undoubtedly primary difference between them. Being born from it and so on, there is non-difference between them. There is natural relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman, according to Āśmarathya.

1 Brahma-Sūtra, 1.4.20.
2 Bhāmati on Śāṅkara-Bhāṣya on Brahma-Sutra., pp. 415-16, Ed. Niranayasagar, Bombay, 1938.
3 Vedānta-Kaustubha, p. 141, 1.4.20, Benares, 1932.
4 Taittirīya-Upaniṣad, III, 1.

2 *The Doctrine of Āudulomin*[1]

Āuḍulomin looks upon difference and non-difference of the Jīva from Brahman as due to different conditions. The Jīva bound by the limiting adjuncts of body, senses, and mind, is different from Brahman, through knowledge and meditation, it passes out of the body and becomes one with the Highest Self. Āuḍulomin admits the absolute difference between Jīva and Brahman but asserts their unity when the Jīva attains mukti,[2] in accordance with two texts from the Upaniṣads. The first of these is· "eṣa samprasādosmāchharīrātasamuthāya paraṁ jyotirūp-asampādya svenarūpenābhinisampadyate."[3] This Jīva after going out of this body, realises its own nature, attains higher light that is Brahman The second is : "As the flowing rivers disappear in the sea, having lost their name and form thus, a wise man freed from name and form goes to the divine person, higher than high "[4] This shows that as the rivers losing the names and forms abiding in them disappear in the sea, so the Jīva also losing the name and form abiding in it becomes united with the Highest Person. On this view, there is relation of difference between Jiva and Brahman during the state of bondage (buddhā-vasthā) of Jīva, and non-difference during its state of salvation (muktāvasthā) Thus, there is relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman[5] Vācaspati Miśra in his 'Bhāmati' on 'Śānkara-bhāṣya' and Bhāskara in his Sūtrabhāsya quote to compare the saying of Pāñcarātrikas :—

"ā mukter bheda eva syājjīvasyacaparasyaca/muktasva ca na bhedosti bhedahetor abhāvatah//" (up to the moment of liberation being reached the Jīva and Brahman are different. But

1 Brahma-Sūtra, 1 4 21.
2 Sankara-bhāṣya, 1-4-20
3 Chāndogyopaniṣad, VIII 12 3
4 "Yathā nadyah syandamānāh samudre astam gachhuti nāma rūpa vihāya tatha vidvān punyapāpād vimuktah parātparaṁ puruṣaṁ upaiti divyaṁ "
—Muṇḍ , Up , III, II, 8 //
5 Vedānta-Kaustubha, p 140, 1 4 21

liberated Jīva is no longer different from Brahman since there is no further cause of difference).

The technical name of the doctrine advocated by Āuḍulomin is Satyabhedavāda.[1]

3. *The Doctrine of Kāśakṛtsna*[2]

Here is a controversy over this question namely whether Kāśakṛtsna was as exponent of the difference and non-difference or non-dualism. He is interpreted by Śaṅkara as an exponent of non-dualistic, and is interpreted by Bhāskara Bhatt as an upholder of "identity in difference" (Bhedābheda) view in this regard. In fact he has been interpreted by almost all commentators as supporting their different views and regarding him as Monistic, Dualistic, dualistic-cum-monistic or qualified monistic as is clear from the commentaries of Śaṅkara, Madhva, Bhāskara, Śrīkaṇṭha, Rāmānuja etc.[3] But it appears that Kāśakṛtsna was an exponent of the doctrine of difference and non-difference, as is clear from the commentary of Śrīnivāsa namely—"Vedāntakaustubha"[4] Kāśakṛtsna, is of opinion, that the Parmātman dwells in the Jīvātman, who is His niyamya (that is, controlled by Him).[5] Thus, there is a relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman, as the object controlled as well as the controller. As declared by śruti : "He who dwelling in the soul is other than the soul whom the soul does not know, whose body is the Ātman. He who rules into the soul, He is your soul, the inner controller of men, the soul of all" etc. etc. The controller, viz., Lord is denoted by a knower of the object

1 Vedānta-Sūtra (George Thibaut), Vol. I, English Translation of Śānkara-bhāṣya, p. 278, 1.4.20, Delhi.

2 Brahma-Sūtra, 1.4.22.

3 (i) Pandey, Dr. K.C., "Dualism-cum-Monism (Bhedābheda-vāda)", Journal of Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, Allahabad, Vol. XXXXI, pts. 1-4, Nov., 1963-August, 1965.

4 "tadevaṁ munitrayamatadvārā prasaṅgāt Bhedābhedaprakāro bhagavatā darśitāḥ. —Vedānta-kaustubha, 1.4.22, p. 141.

5 Miśra, Umesha, "Nimbārka School of Vedānta", p. 63, Allahabad, 1963.

controlled by Him, viz, Jīva[1] And again, Srīpati[2] interprets that Kāśakṛtsna abides by the doctrine of bhedābheda which is declared by the śruti texts which, without being contradictory to each other, enunciate in 'dvāsuparnā' etc and other texts the bheda doctrine and the abheda doctrine in 'tattvamasi' etc and other texts In order to point out clearly the existence of bheda and abheda between the Jīva and Brahman, Kāśakrtsna here declares that all sruti texts purport to propound the underlying doctrine of Bhedābheda Therefore, the third doctrine of bhedābheda is the highest essential truth declared by all the śruti texts, and so it must be understood Hundreds of sruti texts declare that during the samsārāvasthā Jīva and *Brahman are quite distinct from* each other and separate, and that during the Mokṣadasā abheda is declared to be the established truth, sruti texts like the following

"Eṣa sampra-sādortha ātmā sarīrat samuthāya paramjyoti rūpaṁ sampādya svena rūpenābhinisapadyate" etc etc

SECOND STAGE

1 *The Doctrine of Lakulisa*

The Lakulīsapāsupata a well known dualistic-cum-monistic system, propounded by Lakulisa in the first half of the second century A D, according to the inscriptional evidence of Mathura pillar and of stone slab of Somanatha, is based upon the five vedic Mantras "Sadyojātaṁ"[3] etc, Lakulisa wrote a "paśupata-Sūtra" Pāśupata-sūtra with the commentary of Kauṇḍinya namely "pañcārthibhāṣya" is available at present Pāśupata-Sūtra is divided into five chapters, which is based on the five

---

1 Vedanta-Kaustubha, p 141, 1 4 22

2 (a) Srikara-Bhāṣya, Vol I, Introduction, p 427, Ed. C Hayavadana Rao, Banglore, 1936

(b) Srikara-Bhāṣya, Vol II, p 174, Banglore, 1936

3 Pandey, Dr K C, "Dualistic-cum-Monistic (Bhedabheda-vāda)", Journal of Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, Allahabad, Vol XXXXI, Pts 1 4,Nov, 1963-August 1965, p 245

Vedic Mantras of Taittirīyāraṇyaka. Five Vedic Mantras are following :

"Sadyojātaṁ prapadyāmi"
"Vāmadevāya namaḥ"
"Agnorebhyoth ghorebhya"
Tatpuruṣāya vidmahe"
"Iśānaḥ sarvavidyānāṁ."

It means, these five Anuvākas of the Taittirīyāraṇyaka are the basis of the Lakulīśa pāśupata system. Sāyaṇa in his interpretation of this text agrees that they refer to śaivism in general, both as a religion and as a philosophy.

Bhedābheda of Lakulīṣa

According to the Lakulīśa pāśupata there are five primary categories, viz., (i) Kāraṇa or pati, (ii) Kārya or paśu, (iii) yoga, (iv) Vidhi, (v) Duḥkhānta.

Here, it may, therefore, be useful to discuss briefly the concept of the Kāraṇa or pati and the concept of the kārya or paśu, to understand the doctrine of difference and non-difference, as propounded by Lakulīśa.

(a) The word pati, Kāraṇa and Brahman are synonymous. Pati is the cause of all effect (Kārya), viz., Vidyā, kāla and paśu.[1] He is both the material cause and the efficient cause of the universe. The universe springs up (bhavodbhavaḥ) from the Brahman, as does a sprout from a seed. He is the cause of both the creation and dissolusion of the world. He bestows grace. He transcends all. He is playful.[2] He is higher than the liberated.[3] He has perfect powers of knowledge and action. They constitute his essential nature exactly as heat does that of

1 Pāśupatasutra, 55.
2 Ibid., 56.
3 Ibid., 57.

fire He inspires fear of the immortal deeds in the bound Jīvas and unites them with the merit and demerit of the deeds [1]

(b) The kārya or paśu is controlled by the Lord or pati (pāśanāt paśun) [2] The kārya is that which is dependent on something ulterior, it is threefold, sentience, the insentient, and the sentient [3]

(c) Relation between the cause (pati or kārana) and the effect (kārya) :

There has been a great controvercy over the question of the doctrine of causality in Indian Philosophy According to Nyāya-vaiśeṣika philosophy, the effect, is non-eternal (asat) but the effect according to Lakulīsa pāśupata is eternal (sat) Nor is the effect mere illusion, as the vedāntin asserts For, the Lakulīśa pāśupata is not Monism, but Dualism-cum-non dualism It admits that the reality is not pure unity but unity in multiplicity and, therefore the multiplicity according to it, exists in unity just as do the stars in heaven The creation is nothing more than the arrangement of what exists in a creation form (vrtti lābha) [4] The traid abides in His power,[5] which constitutes His very being, the most essential nature, the principal attribute the chief characteristic, Dharma There is no confused existence (Vrttisankara)[6] between the cause and the effect like water in milk On the other hand, there is different existence between the cause and the effect, like the light of the eyes and that of the sun or of lamp, which illumines the object at the time of perception He is all-pervading But the pervasiveness of the different dependent categories of the "effect" is of limited nature Each higher category pervades the lower

1 Ibid , 57.
2 Ibid,, 5
3 Sarvadarsana-Sangraha, Eng Translation by E B Cowell and A E Gough, p 106, Benares, 1961
4 Pāśupata-Sūtra, 60
5 Ibid , 58
6 Ibid,, 59

So, in the Lakulīśa pāśupata system, different effeets do not have their existence in isolation from each other, like cells in a honey-comb. The pervaded and the pervading are to be seen differently as water is grasped differently from the colour that colours it.

Thus, the cause and the effect exist together, but maintain their respective entities because of different nature, though both of them are pervasive. The effect is as eternal as the cause. For, the cause cannot be logically represented to be the cause without the effect, nor can pati be spoken of as pati without something to Lord over. The effect has its existence in the cause as does a seed in the earth. The cause is free (svatantra) and the effect is "not-free" (asvatantra). The former is the pati and the later is paśu. The one stands for the cit and the other for both cit and acit.

Thus, Lakulīśa pāśupata system is dependent on "Satkārya-vāda". In creation the Lord is free. It has already been observed according to Lakulīśa that there is essential difference between the individual self and the highest self, the cause and the effect and the sentient and non-sentient. Though, the cause (pati) and the effect (paśu) are mutually different, the effect (paśu), viz., vidyā, kāla, rūpa, has neither free being out of pati, nor equal superiority with the pati, yet the effect is dependent and "not-free" (asvatantra), because of to be carried on, to be created and to be effected. So, Lakulīśa pāśupata is the follower of the doctrine of difference and non-difference. Because, it thinks that there is essentially difference between the cause and the effect but there is non-difference also, the effect merely exists in the cause. And again, the cause and the effect are non-different because the unmanifest state of the effect is known as Kāraṇa and the manifest state of the cause is known as kārya. Thus, there is relation of difference and non-difference between the cause and the effect.[1]

1 Pandey, Dr. K.C., 'Śaivadarśanabindu", pp. 35-36, 39-41, 58, Benares, Samvat 2021, and "Bhāskarī", Vol. III, "An Outline of Śaiva Philosophy", pp. CXX-XXXVI, CXIII-CXVI, Lucknow, 1954.

Thus, Lakulīśa pāsupata presents his doctrine of difference and non-difference

2. *The Doctrine of Bhartrprapañca*

Bhartṛprapañca is known from references only None of his works is, at present, available He wrote a commentary on the Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad As Sankara did, and B's commentary was even more voluminous than Sankara's, and he was an old Vedantin anterior even to Sankara [1]

To understand his doctrine of Bhedābheda, it may, therefore, be useful to discuss the concept of Brahman, Jiva and the *world*

Bhartrprapañca recognized like Sankara that Brahman is para (higher) and apara (lower) Brahman is both one and *many* Just as a cow is one as a substance, but its features, the dewlap etc, are many [2] Thus, Brahman is different and non-different

He does not explain like Śankara that Jīva or lower Brahman is vivarta of the higher Brahman And he does not explain like Bhāskara that diversity of Brahman is adventitious But he says that para (higher) and apara (lower) or unity and diversity of Brahman, both are real Just as an ocean has unity as cause of waves, foam and bubbles etc, and has diversity as effects viz waves, foam and bubbles etc And, therefore, both are real [3]

Bhartṛprapañca admits the Brahmaparināmavāda, but he does not admit the vivartavāda of Sañkara According to him Brahman transforms itself by its own creative urge into light form of world and Jiva Which are thus 1 Antaryā-

1 Hiriyana, Prof M, "Bhartrprapañca—An Old Vedantin"—Proceedings and Transactions of All India Oriental Conference, Session III, Madras, 1924, and Indian Antiquary, Vol LIII, 1924

2 Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad, Sānkara-Bhāṣya, 4 3 30

3 Sānkara-Bhāṣya on Brahma-Sutra, 2 1 14, p 456, Bombay, 1938

min, 2. Sākṣin, 3. Avyākṛta, 4. Sūtra, 5. Virāj, 6. Devatā, 7. Jāti, and 8. Piṇḍa.[1] Prof. Hiriyana[2] says that these eight forms together with Brahman according to Bhartṛprapañca, may be divided into three rāśis, in which we have the three-fold subject matter of all religion and philosophy, viz., God, soul and matter.

1. Paramātmarāśi.
2. Mūrtāmūrta-rāśi.
3. Jīva-rāśi.

1. Brahman is antarayāmi or inner-ruler of all. So this rāśi is absolute Brahman.

2. This is known as six material forms of the world. Which are thus : Avyākṛta—An elementary substance from which all things were created, Sūtra—the adjunct of the logos, Virāj—the visible universe, Devatā—an organ of sense, Jāti—a class, and Piṇḍa—the body.

3. In this rāsi, Jīvas or the Sākṣin are real transformation of Brahman. Bhartṛprapañca already counts it as a third rāsi.

Bhartṛprapañca explains Brahman, Jīva and the world relation thus, there is no absolute difference between these three and there is no absolute non-difference like Śaṅkara. But the relation of difference and non-difference (Bhedābheda) between these three is obvious.[3] To make it clear, in his Bhāṣya, at Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad 5. 1. 1., Śaṅkara tells us that the one Brahman has got a dualistic as well as a non-dualistic aspect (dvaitādvaitātamakaṁ). For example, the ocean consists of water, waves, foam, bubbles etc. As the water is real and waves appear and disappear, but are a part of the ocean itself, and

1 Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadabhāṣyavārtikaṁ, 2.3.
2 Hiriyana, Prof. M. "Bhartṛprapañca—An old Vedāntin," Proceedings and Transactions of A.I.O.C. III, Madras, 1924.
3 Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadavārtikaṁ, p. 876, St. 46, ASS, 1815, 1893.

are absolutely real, in the same way dualistic world is absolutely real, it corresponds to the waves etc, on the water while the supreme Brahman stands for the ocean water and is absolutely real [1]

Prof. Hiriyana[2] says that, *it is difficult to determine which* of these view was in the mind of Bhartṛprapañca Otto Strauss[3] says that the types bhāga-bhāgin and avasthāvatavasthā appear to be the most usual Kārya-Kārana has to be taken in the sense of pariṇāma, and sāmānya-viśeṣa cannot be employed directly on account of Brahman not being a Sāmānya in the logical sense of the world On the other hand, Prof. P. N Srinivasachari[4] says that according to Bhartṛprapañca the Sūtras bring out this truth by means of the classical analogy of the snake and its coil and the sun and its radiance The cause is, logically speaking, immanent in the effect The whole pervades the part and the universal is realised in and through the particulars But the most adequate Category of Reality is the relation of substance and modes (avasthāvat and avasthā) in which there is a pervading identity that transfigures the parts

3. *The Doctrine of Bhāskara*

Bhāskara wrote a commentary on the Brahma-Sūtra, in regard of the doctrine of difference and non-difference His commentary on Brahma-Sūtra is available, at present, and he belonged to the close of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th Century A D [5]

---

1 Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad with the commentary of Sankara and the glossary of Anandgiri Fd by Dr E. Roer, pp 951-952

2 Hiriyana, Prof M, "Bhartrprapañca—An old Vedānti", Proceedings and Transactions, A I.O C III, Madras, 1924

3 Otto Strauss, "Jīva and Paramātman", D R Bhandarkar Volume, pp *148, 150, Calcutta, 1940*

4 Srinivasachari, Prof P N, "The Philosophy of Bhedābheda" p 152, The Adyar Library, 1950

5 (a) Bhāskara-Bhāṣya, p 7.
(b) Pandey, Dr K C, "Dualism-cum-non-dualism" (Bhedābhedavāda) Journal of Ganganath Jha Research Institute, Allahabad, Vol. XX-XXI, Nov 1963—August 1965, p 246

To make his doctrine of difference and non-difference clear, Bhāskara accepts the three ultimate Realities viz., Brahman or Iśwara, Jīva, and the world.

(i) Bhāskara holds the Brahman to be the cause of the world, its creator, supporter, and destroyer.[1] Brahman is the both material cause and the efficient cause of the world.[2] He is known only by the Scriptural authority.[3]

In fact for Bhāskara, the world is a transformation (pariṇāma) of Brahman, but he does not accept the tradition of Sāṁkhya-yoga which is thus, the world is transformation or pariṇāma of the prakṛti, just as curd is the trasformation of milk. The Brahman possesses infinite power or energy (śakti) and makes this power undergo transformation,[4] so that he can remain what he is. Pariṇām is for Bhāskara the throwing out of energy (Śaktivikṣepa).[5] According to Bhāskara, Brahman has power of two kinds viz., subjective and objective.

Brahman is both one and many. As cause he is one and as effects he is many. Just as gold is one as material cause and many as bracelets, ear-rings etc. Thus, Brahman is different-non-different.[6] Non-different state is natural and different state is adventitious.[7]

Brahman is true being, sentient endless, blissful, omnipotent and omniscient.[8]

---

1 Bhāskara-bhāṣya, 1.1.2, 1.1.11.
2 Ibid., 1.1.2, 1.4.22.
3 Ibid., 1.1.1, 1.1-3.
4 Ibid., p. 97, Kāśī.
5 (a) Bhāskara-bhāṣya, p. 85.
(b) Waltair, P. T. Raju, "Identity in difference in some vedāntic systems", New Indian Antiquary, Vol. II, 1939-40, p. 105, Bombay.
6 Bhāskara-bhāṣya, p. 18.
7 "Sa Cābhinnābhinnasvarūpobhinnarūpa svābhāvikamopādhikaṁ tu bhinnarūpaṁ," Bhāskara-Bhāṣya, pp. 141, 2.3.43.
8 "Bhāskara-bhāṣya, p. 24.

(ii) The finite self or Jīva is not a vikāra of the Brahman, for vikāra is an actual transformation, just as the world is a vikāra of prakṛti according to the Sāṁkhya.[1] It is essentially identical with the Brahman such as sparks are with fire.

The Jīva is atomic *in size and is innumerable. Jīva, is the* part (aṁśa) of Brahman. The term aṁśa is employed by Bhāskara in three senses. It may connote (i) the relation of the cause to its effect as when thread is explained as an aṁśa or component of cloth, (ii) a share in property to be divided, or, as in this context, (iii) The principal of self-differentiation through upādhi.[2] The Jīva as a part is adventitious. It is not absolutely different from Brahman, and is not absolutely non-different from Brahman, but is related to Brahman both as different and non-different, just as the sparks are to the fire, as the five-fold prāṇas *to air and as the aesthetic (kāma) to the mind.*[3]

It is the agent of all deeds, but only so long as it is conditioned. It is the enjoyer of all fruits of deeds, pleasure and pain.

(iii) The world is the effect of the Brahman. It is admited by Bhāskara, Brahman is both the material cause and the efficient cause of the world. Like Śaṅkara, Bhāskara does not accept the world as illusion. According to him, it is real and eternal. As the cause and the effect, the world is different and non-different from Brahman during the effected state, and is non-different from Brahman during the causal state.

Aupādhika-Bhedābhedavāda

Bhāskara adopts the doctrine of difference and non-difference (Bhedābheda), as the central truth of vedānta and this is the

---

1 (a) Bhāskara-bhāṣya, p. 134,
(b) Waltair, P. T. Raju, "Identity in Difference in Some Vedāntic Systems", New Indian Antiquary, Vol. II, p. 319, 1939-40.

2 (a) Bhāskara-bhāṣya, 2.3.43.
(b) Srinivasachari P. N., "The Philosophy of Bhedābheda", pp. 73-74.

3 Bhāskara-bhāṣya, 2.3.43, pp. 140-141.

fundamental note of his doctrine.[1] It cannot be objected that difference and non-difference are mutually contradictory. Nor can it be said that two cannot co-exist. To avoid this objection Bhāskara says that everything depends on direct experience, both what is true and what is wrong in the world, so everything must be decided on the basis of direct experience. Because, nothing is seen absolutely different or absolutely non-different in the world of experience. Everything is different and non-different. For example, a cow is different from another cow as individual cow, but non-different from it as belonging to the same genus 'cow'. Again, a cow is different from a horse as a cow, but non-different from it being an existent substance like it and so on. Similarly a gold ear-ring is different from a gold bracelet but non-different from it as gold.[2] So, direct experience is only source, which guarantees in regarding that difference and non-difference are not mutually contradictory and do co-exist.

Bhāskara says that there is no contradiction between unity and diversity of Brahman as cold and hot, because the relation of cold and hot is not that of cause and effect. But the relation between unity—Brahman and diversity—the world is that of cause and effect, so Brahman is both different and non-different from the world.[3]

It has already been observed that Jīva is the transformation (pariṇāma) of Brahman through his power. It is natural that which is the effect of Brahman, that will be non-different from the Brahman because one effect arises from a cause and abides in a cause. Thus, Jīva is non-different from Brahman. Jīva is different and non-different from Brahman during the effected state of Brahman (kāryāvasthā).

Thus, it is established that Jīva-Jagat is non-different from

1 Bhāskara-bhāṣya, p. 18, 1.1.4.

2 (a) Bhāskara-bhāṣya, pp. 16-17, 1.1.4.

(b) Bose, Roma "Vedānta-pārijāta-Saurabha", Vol. III, p. 193, Calcutta, 1943.

3 Bhāskara-bhāṣya, p. 17.

Brahman during the destruction and salvation. It is natural, Brahman being the cause, and the Jīva-Jagat must be Brahman in nature and essence It means that non-difference (abheda) of Brahman and Jīva-Jagat is natural (svābhāvika) But, Jīva-Jagat is different and non-different from Brahman during the state of creation and sansāra (buddhāvasthā) Here, difference is adventitious (aupādhika), because at the beginning of the Creation the Jīva becomes associated with the upādhis [1]

4 *The Doctrine of Yādavaprakāsa*

Yādavaprakāśa is known from references only. Nothing much is known about Yādavaprakāśa and his philosophy. According to tradition, Yādavaprakāśa was the supporter of the doctrine of difference and non-difference To establish his doctrine of Bhedābheda, there is no clear evidence, because, though, he wrote his commentary on Brahma-Sūtra, yet his commentary is not, at present, available His doctrine has generally been established on the basis of some critical references of works of Rāmānuja and Vedānta-Deśika. Rāmānuja criticizes the doctrine of Yādavaprakāśa in his Vedārthasangrah [2] Vedānta-Deśika devoted a brief chapter in his paramatabhanga to the critical examination of the tenant of Bhāskara and Yādava [3]

According to "Srutiprakāśikā" the glossary on the Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja, which is written by Sudarśanabhaṭṭa, there is relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman as the cause and the effect, as explained by Āśmarathya so such is the view of Yādavaprakāśa, which is called "svābhāvika-Bhedābheda" (Natural difference and non-

1 Chaudury, Dr Roma, "Brahman-Jīva-Jagat Relation—A Unique Theory of Aupāphikabhedābhedavāda," Proceedings and Transactions of the All India Oriental Conference, 22nd Session, *Gauhati, Assam, January 1965, Vol II, p 234*

2 Vedārthasangrah, p 15, *Srī Bhagavad Rāmānuja* Granthamālā, Granthamālā Office, Kanchipuram, 1956

3 Srinivasachari, Prof P N, "The Philosophy of Bhedābheda", p 144

difference).[1] Yādava tries to overcome the discrepancy by the concept of Brahmapariṇām or theory of transformation, by which the absolute which is the sat without a second by its own immanent śakti or potential energy becomes God and the unievrse of the cit and acit like the waves and ripples of the ocean.[2] It proves that the Brahman is the cause of the cit and acit. The cit and acit are the effects of Brahman. In the view of Yādavaprakāśa, thus, there is relation of difference and non-difference between these three ultimate-realities as the cause and the effect, which relation is natural (Svābhāvika).

Third Stage

1. *The Doctrine of Śrī Nimbārkācārya*

In Nimbārka's view, there are three ultimate realities viz. Brahman, Jīva and acit (Jagat), and the relation between these three realities is difference and non-difference.

To understand his doctrine of difference and non-difference, it may, therefore, be useful to say a few words about the concept of Jīva—the enjoyer (Bhoktā), the Brahman (niyantā) and the acit (bhogya), as propounded by Śrīnimbārkācārya.

(i) Jīva is knowledge by nature, dependent on Hari, as in a condition to be conjugated with, or substracted from, a body, is atomic, different in different bodies, and is a knower and infinite.[3]

Jīva is knowledge[4] by nature. It is a peculiar quality of Jīva, which delights the entire body, just as the odour of the flower. It proves that Jīva is different from non-sentient.

---

1 Ayaṁ Yādavaprakāśapakṣosmin sūtra upanyastaḥ/
tatra hi kāryātmanā kāraṇātmanā ca Jīvabrahmanobhedābhedau svābhāvikau matau /
Śrutiprakāśikā on the Śrī-Bhāṣya of Rāmānuja, 1.4.20, p. 148, Vol. II, 1967, Ed. by Govt. India, New Delhi.

2 Srinivasachari, Prof. P. N., "The Philosophy of Bhedābheda", p. 144.

3 Vedānta-kāmadhenu, verse. 1.

4 Vedānta-pārijāta-Saurabha, 2.3.26.

The Jīva, being a knowledge, is knower[1] as well Here is *no contradiction*[2] between knowledge and knower, and is *not* identity with each other. In many cases, we see, the substratum and the attribute are very resembling, but that does not mean *that they are identical* Just as a *gem and its rays are* equally luminous, yet there is no identity, is difference and they stand in the relation of substratum (dharmin) and attribute (dharma)[3]

The Jiva, being a knower, is an ego[4] or, 'I' (ahaṁ) A knower always feels 'I know', 'I want', 'I do' etc.

The Jiva, being an ego is a doer, enjoyer, under the control of Brahman and a part of the Brahman, all these things are true in bondage as well as in liberation[5]

Jīva is atomic *in size*[6] *According to the Svetāśvatara* Upaniṣad, the individual soul (Jīva) is as subtle as a hairpoint divided and sub-divided hundreds of times, Jīva is atomic in size, *in* bondage as well as *in* liberation

Jīva is infinite in number In this evidence, Brahma-Sūtra states *that Jīva is many, Brahman is one, it proves the difference* between Jīva and Brahman[7]

The Jīva is of two kinds :

1 Buddha-Jiva

2 Mukta-Jiva

(ii) Śrī-Nimbārkācārya has given the following characteristics of the Brahman in his vedānta-kāmadhenu "We meditate on the supreme Brahman viz. Kṛṣṇa, Hari, who has eyes like

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-Saurabha, 1 2 12, 1 3 5, 2 3 18
2 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p 4
3 Ibid ,
4 Vedānta-pārijāta-Saurabha, 2 3 18
5 Ibid , 2 3 32-40, 1 3 7 , 2 3 43
6 Ibid , 2 3 19
7 bhedavyapadesāścanyah /
—Brahma-Sūtra, 1.1 22

the lotus, who naturally has destroyed all the defects, is the store of all auspicious attributes, his body is represented by the vyūha and who is attended by all."[1]

Thus, according to Nimbārka, the absolute ultimate reality is Śrīkṛṣṇa himself. He is denoted by the term "Brahman" who is greatest of all because of his infinite, incomprehensible, inherent nature, attributes, powers and so on.[2] He is the cause of the Universe.[3] Brahman alone is the cause of the creation and destruction of the universe. All names and forms arise from him and return to Him.[4] Brahman is both the material cause and the efficient cause of the universe.[5] He is lord of all causes, he is controller of all, He is lord of all.[6]

(iii) The acit or Jagat is of three kinds, viz.

1. Aprākṛta—not derived from prakṛti.
2. Prākṛta—derived from prakṛti.
3. Kāla—the time.

In the things of prākṛta we have the ordinary material objects, it consists of the three guṇas viz. sattva, rajas and tamas.

The process of creation and destruction is as follows.[7] In creation first the ether originates from the lord, from the ether air, from air fire, from fire water, and from water earth. But, in every case, Lord is real creator. In destruction the process is just reverse of the process of ceation viz. first the earth is merged in water, water in fire, fir in air, air in ether and the ether in the Lord. Just like salt is merged in water.

In that process the acit or Jagat is the effect of Brahman. It arises from Brahman and abides in Brahman.

---

1 Vedānta-kāmadhenu, Verse 4.
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-Saurabha, 1.1.1.
3 Ibid,, 1.1.10-12.
4 Ibid., 1.3.42.
5 Ibid., 1.4.23.
6 Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, 3.4.22.
7 Vedānta-pārijāta-Saurabha, 2.3.1-14.

Svābhāvika—Bhedābhedavāda

To explain the relation between above discussed these three ultimate realities, Srīnimbārkācārya adopts his doctrine of natural difference and non-difference (svābhāvika—Bhedābheda)

The mutual difference in the nature and concept of Brahman, *Jīva and the world is obvious It has already been observed* that Brahman is the cause and Jīva his effect and there is a obviously difference between the cause and its effect, just as the ocean and its waves, the sun and its lustre [1]

There is difference between Jīva and Brahman as the part and the whole Jīva is the part of Brahman Brahman is the whole

Brahman is as the object to be obtained while the Jīva is as the obtainer [2] Brahman is the object to be known[3] and the object to be worshipped,[4] while Jīva is knower[5] and worshipper [6] The mutual difference is obvious between them

There Is difference between Jīva and Brahman, that Brahman is ever-free from all sins, while Jīva is an enjoyer of the fruits of all deeds done by himself,[7]

Again, Brahman is inner-controller, while Jiva is not inner-controller because both the Kānvas as well as the Mādhyandinas depict Jiva as different from the inner-controller viz Brahman [8]

Thus, the mutual difference between Jiva and Brahman is natural and eternal

On the other hand, the mutual difference between Jagat and Brahman is also obvious Brahman is the cause, the Jagat is

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-Saurabha, 2 1 13
2 Ibid , 1 1 18
3 Ibid , 1 2 12
4 Ibid , 1 2 12
5 Ibid , 1 2 12
6 Ibid , 1 2 12
7 Ibid,, 1 2 8
8 Ibid , 1 2 21

the effect. Both cannot be identical. Brahman is omniscient and unlimited by time, space, and unit, while Jagat is inanimate, and gross. Thus, the mutual difference of the three is distinctly established, which is natural and eternal.

In reality, there is non-difference between these three which is established by the scriptural authority. And it has already been observed that Brahman is cause, and Jīva and Jagat are effects. On the one hand, there is difference between cause and effect, on the other, there is non-difference between two. Because, the effect is dependent on the cause for its activities and existence, just like, the ear-ring is different from the bracelet in name and shape simply an account of kuṇḍalattva and kaṭakattva, but is non-different so far as, gold is concerned. The ear-ring and bracelet are dependent on gold for their existence and activities, in the absence of gold the ear-ring and bracelet and their activities and existence are impossible. In the same way, Jīva and Jagat are non-different from the Brahman as cause and the effect.

There is difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman in bondage state of Jīva, on the other hand, there is difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman in the liberated state of Jīva also, liberated Jīva (mukta-Jīva) is non-different from Brahman being existence, consciousness, bliss in essence, but it, too, is different from Brahman, because Jiva is atomic in size in bondage as well as in liberation and even a liberated Jiva lacks the powers of Brahman.[1]

In the very same manner, Jagat is different and non-different from the Brahman during creation as well as during destruction.

In fact there is neither absolute difference and nor absolute non-difference between these three viz., Brahman, Jiva and Jagat. But the relation between these three is both difference and non-difference. Just like the sun and its lustre.[2] It is true

---

1 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 1.4.21, pp. 140-141.
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-Saurabha, 3.2.28.

that there is difference between the sun and its lustre, but there is non-difference so far as the brightness is concerned.

To make the doctrine of natural difference and non-difference clear, as propounded by Nimbārkācārya, the following evidence is final "But on account of the designation of both, like the case of serpent and its coil"[1] In this example, "like the case of serpent and its coil" the serpent is the material cause of the coil On the one hand, this shows the difference between the serpent and its coil On the other, the existence and activity of coil is impossible in the absence of the serpent It shows the non-difference between the serpent and its coil. Likewise, Jīva and Jagat are the effects of the Brahman The relation of the Jīva and Jagat the effects, with Brahman the cause, is natural difference and non-difference (svābhāvikabhedābheda) Thus, it is established that there is relation of natural difference and non-difference (svābhāvikabhedābheda) between these three viz, Jīva—Jagat and Brahman, as propounded by Nimbārkācārya, there is no any contradiction

2. *The Doctrine of Śrīkrsnacaitanya*

Srīkṛṣṇacaitanya was born in 1485 A D ,[2] in Navadvīpa in Bengal To explain his philosophy, he adopts the doctrine of "Acintyabhedābheda", but did not write any commentary on Brahmasūtra He accepted the Srīmadbhāgavat as the commentary on Brahmasūtra[3] None of his works is available His philosophical views were elaborated only by his disciples in their works One of them, Jīvagoswamī was his follower, who has done a famous work namely "ṣatsandarbha"[4] In spite of these sources, one commentary on Brahmasūtra was necessary

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-Saurabha and Kaustubha, 3 2 27

2 "The religious condition, of Bengal was far from satisfactory at the time (A D 1485) when Sricaitanya (Srīgaurānga) was born "—Radhagovindnath, "A Survey of the Caitanya Movement', The Cultural Heritage of India, Vol IV, Calcutta, 1956

3 "Brahmasūtrānāmarthasatesāmakṛtrimbhāsyabhūtaityartha /" —Tattva-Sandarbha, 11 anuchheda

4 Satsandarbha-Tattvasandarbha, p 4, sloka 3-5

to prove the doctrine of "Acintya-bhedābheda" of Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya. In the nineteenth century, Baladevavidyābhūṣaṇa wrote a commentary on Brahmasūtra namely "Govindabhāṣya"[1] in support of the doctrine of "Acintya bhedābheda". Here, the doctrine of Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya is elaborated mainly on the basis of Govindabhāṣya.

Baladeva admits of five tattvas, namely Iśwara, Jīva, prakṛti, Kāla, Karma.[2] It may, therefore, be useful to discuss briefly the concept of the Jīva, Iśwara, and the prakṛti, to understand the doctrine of "Acintya-bhedābheda", as propounded by Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya.

(i) "The nature of Jīva is that it is an eternal servant of Kṛṣṇa. Jīva is the marginal potency of Kṛṣṇa, and is a manifestation of a distinct-non-distinct relation with Kṛṣṇa."[3] This quotation in short gives the conception of the Jīva. But it requires to be explained further.

Jīva is by nature eternal. Material objects are only destroyed and are created, these are only transitory, while Jīva is never created nor can it have any destruction.[4] Refers also in Kaṭhopaniṣad 1/2/18, "The soul has neither any birth, nor any death ; it does not spring from any other thing, none spring from it." Again, Śvetāśvatara "Two unborn ones, the knower and non-knower, the lord and non-lord. Further; Eternal among eternal, conscious among conscious etc.

Jīva is by nature knowledge as well as knower.[5] "Who is

---

1 Vidyārūpaṁ bhūṣaṇaṁ me pradāya khyātiṁ ninye ten yo Śrīgovindaḥ Svapnanirddiṣṭabhāṣyo rādhābandhurbandhuragaḥ sa Jiyat / Govindabhāṣya-avataraṇikā, pp. 5., Mathura, Samvt 2011.

2 Tathā hi Iśwara-Jīva-prakṛti-Kāla-karmāṇi pañcatattvāni śrūyante-Govinda-bhāṣya. pp. 2.

3 "Jīver svarūp haya-kṛṣṇer nita dāsa, kṛṣṇer tatastha śakti-bhedābheda prakāsa."—'Finite-self', Ed. by B.H. Bon Maharaj, pp. 70, Institute of Oriental Philosophy, Vrindavan, 1963.

4 Govinda-bhāṣya, 2.3.16.

5 Ibid., 2.3.17.

dwelling in knowledge", and "I slept happily, but I could know nothing". These two kinds of śruti prove that Jīva is knowledge as well as knower.

Jīva is an active agent.[1] Being an active agent Jīva is enjoyer.[2] Jīva is the part and the potency of the lord.[3] In this connection Jīva is both different and non-different from Brahman. Jīva is atomic in size.[4]

Jīva is plural in number.[5] "Pādosyasarvabhūtāni" in this sentence of śruti, "Sarvabhūtāni" shows the plurality of Jīva. Again, though all Jīvas are same in nature, yet there is difference owing to their deeds.[6]

Jīva is of two kinds :

1. The bound (Buddha Jīva).
2. The liberated (Mukta-Jīva).

(ii) Śrīkṛṣṇa is himself ultimate reality. He is nirguṇa, free from the three guṇas of prakṛti viz. sattva, rajas and tamas, and is saguna Brahman, being a store house of all auspicious attributes.[7] He has an infinity of auspicious attributes and inconceivable powers.[8]

Brahman has three powers viz., parāśakti, aparāśakti and avidyā-śakti.[9] The parāśakti is called Viṣṇuśakti or svarūpaśakti, the aparākṣetrajña and avidyākarma or māyāśakti.[10] Through the aparā and māyā-śakti, he constitutes the universe of cit and acit and through his parā-śakti which is three fold viz., samvit or

1 Govinda-bhāṣya, 2.3 31.
2 Ibid,, 2.3.31-38.
3 Ibid., 2.3.41.
4 Ibid., 2.3.18-30.
5 Ibid., 2.3.42.
6 Ibid., 2.3.49.
7 Ibid., 1.1.11.
8 Ibid., 1.1.2.
9 Ibid., 1.4.26.
10 "Viṣṇu śaktiparā proktā kṣetrajñabhaya tathāparā /
Avidyā-karma-saṁjñanyatritiya śaktirisyte."

jñāna-śakti, sandhinī or bala-śaktī and hilādini or kriyā-śakti. He has knowledge, existence and bliss. The power and attribute of Brahman are identical with Brahman owing to the identity of substance and attributes. Just as the serpent and its coil,[1] and the sun and its lustre.[2]

Brahman is both the material cause and the efficient cause of the universe. He is efficient cause through his parā-śakti and he is material cause through his aparā-śakti.[3] As the efficient cause, the Brahman is unchangeable or kūṭastha, as the material cause he is subject to modification or pariṇāmin. It means Brahman is cause as well as the effect with his powers. Brahman is the subtle powerful in causal state ; and he is the gross-powerful in the effected state.[4] Thus, there is relation of difference and non-difference between the cause and the effect as the power and the powerful.

(iii) The world is an effect and power of the Brahman. Brahman constitutes the world through his avidyā or māyā śakti. His māyā-śakti is also called tamas. It means the world is a combination of three guṇas viz., sattva, rajas, tamas.[5]

Acintya-bhedābhedavāda

Here is a question what is the relation between above discussed these three ultimate realities ?

The mutual difference in the nature and concept of Brahman, Jīva and world is obvious. It has already been observed that Brahman is all-knowing, all-powerful and omniscient, while the Jīva is knowing little and has limited power. Brahman is absolute, while Jiva is atomic. Brahman is creator, supporter, destroyer, while Jiva is created, supported and controlled by Brahman. The world is inanimate and gross. Thus, the mutual difference of the three is distinctly established.

1 Govinda-bhāṣya, 3.2.28.
2 Ibid., 3.2.29.
3 Ibid., 1.4.26.
4 Ibid., 1.4.26.
5 Ibid., 1.4.26.

In reality, there is mutual non-difference, in the three aspects of knowledge, existence, and bliss viz, sat, cit and ānanda of Brahman These three Brahman, Jīva and world are identical.

Thus, there is relation of both difference and non-difference between them. There is no contradiction There is a hidden harmony behind the apparent contradition of difference and non-difference When Srīcaitanya establishes the relation between Brahman and Jīva as Bhedābheda-prakāśa, he means to say that it is true that there cannot be both difference and non-difference in the same aspect But there can be identity in certain aspects and difference in certain other aspects of the same objects Such difference and non-difference are not necessarily self-contradictory [1] Regarding this theory, and being a follower of the school of "Acintaya-bhedābheda" Jīvagoswamī[2] says that, there is no finality about reasoning, so the absolute difference in Jīva and Brahman is impossible, there being unlimited defects in difference like the non-difference Therefore, as difference is impossible, in the same manner non-difference is, too, impossible We accept "the inconceivable difference and non-difference "(Acintyabhedābhedavāda) Again he says,[3] there is relation of difference and non-difference as the power and powerful There is non-difference in essence between the power and powerful, and yet difference as manifestation as an aspect of the same substance As for example, "the musk and its odour" and, "the fire and its

---

1 Swami, B H Bon Mahraj, "Finite-self", pp 82, Vrindavan, 1963

2 "apare tu"tarkāpratiṣthānāt"(Brahma-Sūtra 2 1 11)bhedepyabhedepi nirmaryādadoṣasantatidarsanena bhinnatayā cintayitumaśakyat vadhbhedaṁ sādhyantah tadavadabhinnatyapicintayitumaśakyatvād bhedamapi sādhayantocintyabhedābhedavādam svikurvanti" /

—"Sarva-Samvādinī of Jīvagoswāmī, pp 145-146, Radhakunda (Mathura), Samat 2022

3 "tasmāt svarūpād bhinnatvena cintayitumaśakyatvād bhedabhinnatvena cintayitumaśakyatvādabhedaśca pratīyate iti śakti-śaktimatorbhedābhedāvevāngikṛtau tau ca acintyau iti / —Sarva-Samvādinī of Jīvagoswāmī, pp 33, Radhakunda (Mathura), Samat 2022

burning power." The musk is identical with its odour. The fire is identical with its burning power. We cannot remove the odour and the burning-power from the musk and the fire. It means, there is identity between the power and powerful, yet there is difference also, because the odour and the burning power are manifestations of the musk and the fire. Thus, there is neither absolute difference nor the absolute non-difference, between the power and powerful ; We accept both 'difference and non-difference ; the entire system of relation is a great, inconceivable mystery.[1]

The concept of "acintya" is not similar to Śaṅkara's 'anirvacanīya.' Because, if it is accepted that the māyā is the power of Brahman, the establishment of non-dualism ; is not possible, and again if the māyā of Śaṅkara, is not accepted, too is impossible. So, the term of "anirvacaniyā" of Śaṅkara is not similar to the term of 'acintya' of Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya.[2]

Śrīdharaswāmī explains the 'acintya' as a follows : "He has inconceivable nature on account of unlimited magnanimity."[3] Again Jīvagoswāmī says in Bhāgavatsandarbha : "which makes the impossible possible that is called "inconceivable" (acintya)."[4]

Thus, it is established, that, according to Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya, there is relation of difference and non-difference between these three ultimate realities, which is inconceivable.

3. *The doctrine of Śrīpati*

Śrīpati wrote a commentary on the Vedāntasūtra-namely "Śrīkarabhāṣya," in the 12th Century A.D. His doctrine is referred to by various names, such as, 'Bhedābheda, Dvaitād-

---

1 Sundranandavidyavinoda,"Śrīcaitanyadeva" (in Hindi). p. 395, Calcutta, 1953.

2 Sundranandavidyavinoda, "Acintyabhedābhedavāda" (in Bengali p. 9, Calcutta, 1951.

2 "aparimitamahimatvādacintyarūpaṁ" /

4 "durghaṭaghaṭakatvaṁ hyacintyatvaṁ". /
—Bhāgavata-Sandarbha anuchheda, 16.

vaita, and viśeṣādvaita'[1] and again, (i) Dvaitādvaita, (ii) Viśeṣādvaita, (iii) Seśvarādvaita, (iv) Śivādvaita, (v) Sarvaśrutisārmata, and (vi) Bhedābheda.[2]

It may, therefore, be necessary to say, a few words about the concept of Brahman or Śiva and the concept of Jīva or paśu, to make his doctrine of difference and non-difference, as propounded by Śrīpati clear.

The words Brahman, para, Śiva and pati are used by Śrīpati as synonyms. Brahman is 'Saviśeṣa' but not 'Nirviśeṣa.'[3] Brahman is both the material cause and the efficient cause. The universe is the transformation of the Brahman. When He himself remains only its efficient cause and He transforms into world his energy or māyāśakti its material cause.[4]

Jīva is not born but eternal.[5] Jīva is different from the form the creation of the physical world.[6] Jīva is a part of Brahman.[7] Jīva is of two kinds, viz., Baddha and Mukta. In liberation, the Jīva becomes identical with Brahman, but it cannot possess the power of creation and remains secondary to Brahman.[8] Jīva is atomic[9] in size, and not all pervasive.

It has already been observed that Brahman is a different Category from the Jīva. Brahman is the object of worship, all-pervasive and omniscient, while Jīva is worshipper, has spatial limitation and possesses limited knowledge. But in the state of liberation there is union of the two. He admits that the aforesaid limitation of the Jīva are beginningless and natural. But he asserts

---

1 Śrīkara-bhāṣya, Vol. II, p. 2, Ed. C. Hayavadana Rao, Banglore, 1236.
2 Śrīkara-bhāṣya, Vol. II, p. 195.
3 Ibid., Vol. II, p. 15.
4 Ibid., pp. 179-180.
5 Ibid,, p. 29.
6 Ibid,, p. 261.
7 Ibid., p. 48.
8 Ibid., IV. V. 17.
9 Ibid.. p. 263.

that Jīva gets freedom from these natural differences and becomes identical with the Brahman. As Śruti says "The rivers flowing when go to the ocean disappear into the ocean leaving name and forms, so a wiseman losing his name and form attains the divine person, higher than high" (chāndogyopaniṣad 8. 3. 4). In arguing for the difference and non-difference, Śrīpati seeks invariably the help of nyāyas, like "bhramarakītaśuktisalilādiṣu". It means that we find that a fly of natural birth changes its in born nature and becomes a bee, and rain water, getting into a mother-of-pearl becomes pearl. Thus, Śrīpati concludes that there is beginningless difference between Jīva and Brahman, but in liberated state of Jīva, there is non difference, of the two. This identity is natural as well as of form. He emphasizes this point again and again.[1]

If it is asked how can both identity and difference hold if identity as of form also, Śrīpati's possible answer is that difference holds only in bondage and identity in mukti so that identity and difference are not to be found simultaneously but at different times.[2]

His doctrine of difference and non-difference is natural like the case of the serpent and its coil.[3]

Śrīpati follows the Kāśakṛtsna, because he is an exponent of the Bhedābhedavāda, takes all the śruti texts into account that represent the central view of the vedānta.[4] But his doctrine is clearly similar to the doctrine of difference and *non-difference*, as propounded by Auḍulomin.[5]

---

1 Śrīkara-bhāṣya, Vol. II, pp. 71, 261, 273, 478.

2 (a) Śrīkara-bhāṣya, Vol. II, pp. 338.
  (b) Waltair, P. T. Raju, "Identity in Difference in Some Vedāntic Schools", New Indian Antiquary, Vol. II, Bombay, p. 330.

3 Śrīkara-bhāṣya, Vol. II, p. 6.

4 Pandey, Dr. K. C., "Bhāskarī", Vol. III, p. XLVIII.

5 Pandey, Dr. K. C., "Śaivadarśanabindu"

3

THE DOCTRINE OF NATURAL DIFFERENCE AND NON-DIFFERENCE

(SVĀBHĀVIKA-BHEDĀBHEDAVĀDA)

---

1 *Difference between Jīva and Brahman*

(A) In the philosophy of Nimbārka, the mutual difference in the nature and concept of Jīva and Brahman is obvious Brahman is the cause and Jīva his effect or transformation There is a difference between the cause and its effect, as between the clay and the pots, dishes etc , between the gold and the bracelets, ear-rings etc , between the tree and the leaves, fruits etc , between the sea and the foams, waves etc , and between the sun and its rays Similarly, there is a difference between the Jiva (the enjoyer) and the Brahman (controller)[1]

And again, Nimbārka points out that there is difference between Jīva and Brahman as between the cause and the effect He says that the creator of the world viz Brahman is something more than the embodied soul, the enjoyer of pleasure and pain, "on account of the indication of difference"[2] As in passage . "O the soul, indeed, should be seen', 'the knower of *Brahman attains the highest', 'who controls the soul within* '"[3]

Moreover, just as in ordinary life, the diamond the lapis lazuli, the ruby and the rest, which are modification of the earth, are different from the earth, and the leaf and so on, which are modification of the tree, are different from tree , the ray of diamond is different from the diamond So, the Jīva which is modification of the Brahman, is different from Brahman [4]

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha and Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 1 13
2 Adhikam tu bhedanirdeśāt—Brahma sūtra, 2 1 21
3 Venānta-pārijāta saurabha and vedānta-kaustubha, 2 1 21
4 Ibid , 2 1 22

There is a difference between Jīva and Brahman as between the part and the whole. Jīva is the part of Brahman. Brahman is the whole. As declared by the śruti : "For it is a part of the highest." A 'part' means a 'power', it is clear from śruti : "This Jīva, a power of highest, is small in power and not independent."[5]

The vedic mantra also confirms it. The part idea comes from the Puruṣasūkta, quoted in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (3. 12. 6) "pādo'sya viśvabhūtāni tripādasyāmṛtaṁ divi" (all the being are His foot, immortal in the heaven is His three feet). A 'feet' means a 'part'[6].

The smṛti also corroborates the concept of part, thus "in this world of life the Jīva is my own part, in the form of eternal part." (Gītā 15.7).[3]

The relation of part and whole declares : that there is a difference between Jīva and Brahman, "On account of the designation of variety", i.e., on account of the designation of difference. This Jīva is, by nature, a part, and subject to bondage and salvation, while Brahman is, by nature, whole and the ocean of a mass of attributes like omniscience and the rest. The following are designations of difference : "Who rules the soul within ; having entered within, the ruler of men ; the soul indeed is supreme, self-dependent, possessing superior qualities, the Jīva is less powerful, dependent, lowest, the two unborn selves, the knower and the non-knower, the lord and the non-lord.[2]"[4]

The statement of difference (bheda) is expressed by Nimbārkācārya in Brahma-sūtra 1. 1. 18. The Jiva is different from Brahman, 'on account of the designation of difference.'[5] Just as the Vedicmantra : "He is indeed, the essence ; For indeed on

---

1 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2.3.42.
2 Ibid,, 2.3.43.
3 Ibid., 2.3.44.
4 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha and Vedānta-kaustubha, 2.3.42.
5 bhedavyapadeśācca/Brahma-sūtra, 1.1.18.

attaining the essence, he becomes blissful" It designates a difference between Brahman as the object to be obtained and the Jīva as the obtainer, the obtainer cannot be the object to be obtained Thus, there is a difference of nature between Jīva and Brahman, otherwise, an intermixture of attributes will result[1] To prove this statement of difference, Nimbārkācārya says that the Jīva is not blissful but only Brahman, because Brahman is the cause of the bliss of Jīva ,[2] and the bliss of the Jīva is momentary, while the bliss of Brahman is endless

Here a doubt arises that when Jīva and Brahman, both are conscious, both must be blissfull As sruti says "may my (sheaths) consisting of food, consisting of the vital-breath, consisting of the mind, consisting of understanding and consisting of bliss, be purified "[3] It is said that what consists of bliss is something to be purified , and as it is impossible for the ever-pure Supreme Soul to be something to be purified, so that which is consists of bliss is the Jīva

To this, the answer is as follows that blissful is Brahman alone, on account of repetition viz , the word 'bliss' has been repeated many times in scripture in reference to Brahman alone[4] So, it is established that Jīva is different from Brahman, because on attaining him the Jiva comes to be united with bliss[5]

Who is within the sun, within the eye, and is to be worshipped by those who are desirous of salvation? He is Brahman alone, not Jīva. To prove this Nimbārkācārya explains "antastaddharmopadesāt" that is there is difference between Brahman and Jīva because Brahman has special qualities such as : he is free from all sins, he is the soul of all and so on[6]

1 Vedanta-pārijāta-saurabha and Vedanta-kaustubha, 1 1 18
2 Vedanta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1 1 15
3 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 1 1 13
4 Ibid , 1 1 13
5 Vedānta-pārijāta saurabha, 1 1 20
6 Ibid , 1 1 21

The statement of difference (bheda) is further expressed by Nimbārka in his commentary on Brahma-sūtra 1.1.22. 'bheda-vyapadeśāccānyaḥ." It means, by nature, Brahman is different from the individual souls of the sun and the rest, within which He dwells, "on account of the designation of difference." Again, it means that Brahman in Jīva, who is śarīrābhimānin, is different by nature. It is also mentioned in the śruti : "who dwelling into the sun, is other than the sun, the sun does not know him, of whom the sun is the body, who controls the sun from within, He is your soul, the inner controller, immortal." Thus, it is established that Brahman is different from Jīva, within which He dwells.[2]

"Sarvaṁ khalvidaṁ brahma tajjalāniti' śantupāsīt" viz., "All this, indeed, is Brahman, rising from him, disappearing into him and breathing in him ;-calm, one should meditate on him."[2] For the purpose of meditation it is said that 'manomaya prāṇa śarīra' it means Brahman has a spiritual body and a vital-breath body. Here, it is understood, that for the purpose of meditation the spiritual body is Brahman alone, not Jīva. Because Brahman alone, celebrated in all the vedāntas, is referred to in the words," "sarvaṁ khalvidaṁ brahma."[3] It means that Brahman is difference from Jīva.

To make this clear Nimbārka gives the evidences of śruti and smṛti. First of all He gives the evidence of Brahmad-sūtra "Vivakṣīt guṇopapatteśca" and "anupapattestu na śarīraḥ." Both sūtras declare that Brahman is different from Jīva, "because of the appropriateness of the attributes intended to be stated",[4] and "on account of inappropriateness, not the embodied (soul)".[5] It means Brahman has the spiritual (manomaya) and vital-breath body, the form of light ; He has true volition, has the ether as the soul, has all desires, has all odours, has all tastes etc.,

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha and vedānta-kaustubha, 1.1.22.
2 Chāndogyopaniṣad, 3.14.1.
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1.2.1.
4 Ibid., 1.2.2.
5 Ibid., 1.2.3.

while Jiva has no spiritual body, and has not the above mentioned attributes such as , having all-desires, having all odours etc , "Karmakartavyapadesācca" and "Sabdaviseṣāt" ooth sutras of Brahma sūtra, too, declare, that Braman is different from Jīva" because of the designation of object and agent"[1] and "on account of the difference of words "[2] It means Brahman is object and the Jīva is agent For instance "Having departed from here, I shall attain him,"[3] in this sentence Brahman is object, while Jīva is an agent And on account of difference in words, it is proved also that Jiva and Brahman are denoted by different words, viz , the genitive and the nominative respectively As in śruti , "This my soul is into my heart "[4] In this sentence the mutual difference between Jīva and Brahman is obvious

To conclude this statement of difference (bheda) Nimbārka further gives the evidences of smṛti 'O Arjuna the lord dwells in the heart of all beings '[5] 'He who sees me everywhere and sees everything in me, of him I will never lose hold, and he shall never loss hold of me ,'[6] 'He, who established in unity worships me abiding within all beings,' 'that yogin rests in me whatever be his mode of living '[7] 'There is nothing higher than I, O Dhanañjaya, 'all this is threaded in me as rows of gems in a string '[8] 'Since I excel the perishable, and am more good than the imperishable, I am renowned in the world, and in the veda as the supreme person (purusottama) '[9] All these above evidences establish the mutual difference between Jīva and Brahman

There is difference between Jiva and Brahman, Brahman, is ever-free from all sins, while Jiva is an enjoyer of the fruits of

---

1 Vedānta-pārijata-saurabha, 1 2 4
2 Ibid , 1 2 5
3 Chāndogyopanisad, 3 14 4
4 Ibid , 3 14 3
5 Gītā, 18 61
6 Ibid , 6 30
7 Ibid , 6 31
8 Ibid , 7 7.
9 Ibid , 15 18

the deeds done by itself.[1] Scripture is the sole proof. Such as: "Of these, He who is the supreme self is called to be eternal and devoid of all properties of matter." "He is not smeared even by the fruit, as a lotus-leaf is not touched by water, the active self, on the other hand, is another, who is liable to release and bondage."[2] Thus, it is established that Jīva is an enjoyer of the fruits of the deeds, while Brahman is ever-free from all sins.

Brahman is an eater who is destroyer of world, while the movable and the immovable are food which have death for their condiment. It declares that Brahman is different from Jīva. As śruti: "He to whom both theBrāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya are the food and death the condiment, who thus knows where He is"[3]

"ṛtam pibantau sukratasya loke guhā praviṣtau."[4] Here it is understood that there is two sentient being viz., Jīva and Supreme-self into the cave, where the mutual difference is obvious between Jīva and Brahman. Brahman is difficult to see, who is hidden by yoga-māyā, who is all-pervasive, who has entered into the cave; while Jīva, who arises with the vital-breath, who is aditi who is made of the deities, who was manifested through the elements, who has entered into the cave.[5] To prove this Nimbārka points out that Brahman is the object to be worshipped[6] and the object to be known;[7] while Jīva is worshipper[5]and knower.[8] The mutual difference is obvious between them.

Brahman is the inner-controller, while Jīva is not the inner-controller because both the Kānvas as well as Mādhyandinas depict Jīva is different from the inner-controller viz., Brahman. As śruti: "He who is dwelling in intelligence", and "He who is dwelling in the soul.'[9]

1 Vedānta-pārtjāta-saurabha, 1.2.8.
2 Ibid., 1.2.8.
3 Ibid., 1.2.9,
4 Kaṭhopaniṣad, 3.1.3, 2.1.7, 1.2.12.
5 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1.2.11.
3 4, 5, 6 Ibid., 1.2.12
9 Ibid., 1.2.21

Brahman is imperishable and the source of beings while Jīva is not denoted by the words 'imperishable and the source of beings' So, there is difference between Jīva and Brahman, on account of attributes and difference As śruti says, the designation of attributes is "All-pervading" and the designation of difference is "Higher than high imperishable"[2]

The statement of difference (bheda) is expressed by Nimbārka in Brahmasūtra 1 3 5, "bhedavyapadeśācca" It means, Jīva cannot be the heaven, the earth and the rest, on account of the designation of difference viz, 'there is difference between the Jīva, which has little knowledge, and is subject to bondage and salvation through the lord's Māyā consisting of the three gunas, and the Brahman, who is omniscient lord It establishes that there is difference between Jīva and Brahman as the knower and the object to be known.'

Regarding the relation of difference between Jīva and Brahman, it is explained that, Brahman is non-eater, while Jiva is an eater[3] As declared by śruti 'Of these two, one tastes the sweet berry, the other looks on without eating."[4]

Jīva and Brahman are different from each other, Brahman is the omniscient, while Jīva is non-knower in deep sleep[5] As in śruti: "Embraced by the intelligent soul, he does not know anything eternal, nor anything internal"[6]

There is indeed difference between, Jīva and Brahman, on account of words like 'lord' and rest[7] On account of śruti like, 'He is lord of all, 'the controller of all', 'The ruler of all', 'He rules all this, 'The lord of all' etc

Jīva is alone that is subject to deeds and participates in

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1 2 23
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha and vedanta-kaustubha, 1 3 5
3 Vedānta-pārijāta saurabha, 1 3 7
4 Mundakopaniṣad, 1 1 3
5 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha and vedānta-kaustubha, 1 3 43
6 Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, 4 3 21.
7 Vedānta pārijāta saurabha and vedānta-kaustubha, 1 3 44

imperfections, but Brahman is not subject to deeds. It is said by śruti : "The two birds of handsome plumage, close friends, cling to the same tree ; One of them eats the sweet berry, while the other, without eating looks on". It means, Jiva is an enjoyer on account of its imperfections, while Brahman is not touched even by an odour of imperfections, and He is not the enjoyer of the names and the forms to be created by Himself.[1]

Thus, Baddha Jīva is entirely different from Brahman, being imperfect, sinful, impure and so on.

(B) There is difference between Jīva and Brahman in bondage as well as in salvation. Mukta Jīva is different from Brahman in two respects. In the first place, the freed-soul is atmotic in size, while Brahman is all-pervading. Atomic Jīva cannot become all-pervasive in salvation. But it can take place in several bodies through its attributes of knowledge, as the case of a lamp, though placed in one place, pervades many places through its rays.[2] As scripture shows : "The individual soul is as subtle as a hair point divided and subdivided hundreds of times. He is potentially infinite. He has to be known."[3]

In the second place, the freed soul, though similar to the Highest Brahman, yet cannot possibly be the lord of all the sentient and the non-sentient, their controller, their supporter, all-pervasive and so on ; and hence its lordship is exclusive of the activities in connection with the universe.[4]

Thus, it is established that Jīva is not absolutely different from Brahman like the Mādhva-philospphy, but the mutual difference between Jīva and Brahman is equally eternal, natural, and undeniable, in bondage as well as in salvation.

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 3.2.13-14.
2 Vedānta-kaustubha, 4.4.15.
3 Śvetaśvatara upaniṣad, 5.9.
4 Vedānta-kaustubha, 4.4.20.

2. *Non difference between Jīva and Brahman*

In reality, there is mutual non-difference between Jīva and Brahman as between the cause and the effect Because, Brahman is the cause of the Jīva and Jīva is the effect or transformation of the Brahman Nimbārkācārya points out that there is non-difference between the cause and the effect, and not absolute difference ; on account of the texts[1] of the śruti, the smṛti and the sūtras In texts : "The effect, having its beginning in speech, is a name, the reality is just the clay', 'the existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning one, without a second', 'He thought, may I be many , may I procreate', 'He created the light , *'All that has this for its soul', 'that is true', 'that is soul', 'thou* art that', 'All this, verily, is Brahman, emanating from Him, disappearing into him and breathing in him', 'that was unmanifest them', 'it became manifest by name and form' and so on "[2]

For this also, says Nimbārka, there is non-difference between the cause and the effect, because the effect is perceived, only when the cause is existent.[3]

Again He says, the effect-which belongs to a posterior time , is present in the cause So the effect is non-different from the cause As declared by śruti "Brahman, indeed, was this is beginning "[4]

Further, he makes it clear, that it cannot be said that the effect does not exist prior to creation, on account of the designation of what is non existent, as in the text "The non-existent, indeed, was this in the beginning". Because, the pre existence of the effect is known from the complementary passage, viz "That was existent "[5] And he again says, the pre-existence of the effect is known from reasoning He admits that the names,

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 1 14.
2 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 1 14,
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 1 15
4 Ibid , 2 1 16
5 Ibid , 2 1 17

forms knowable by means of the evidence of direct perception and the rest, all are real, on account of being perceived. An agent, viz. a potter, makes a pot out of a lump of clay, that is existent. Here, like the lump of clay, the existence of the pot, too, is known from direct perception. Hence the activity of the agent, too, is not useless. Here, it canot be said that as the pot already exists, like the lump of clay, the activity of the agent has no meaning. Because, the pot which was unmanifest before is made manifest : hence the activity of the agent is not useless. The names and forms, mentioned in the veda, are used just as they were before. Thus, according to Nimbārka, the conventional usage of names and forms is not unprecedented. On the other hand, Nimbārka says that the origin of a non-existent effect does not fit in, since the origin of a barely-sprout from fire is never seen. It cannot be said that although fire has no power of producing such an effect, it has, nonetheless, the power of producing sparks-for, in an effect, produced from gold and the rest of a known weight, a different weight is never found. Likewise the sparks of fire, which are its evolutes and known through the evidence of direct perception, are perceived by all, there being no evidence for the imaginary doctrine of a power producing unprecedented objects. Hence, the doctrine of a non-existent effect (Asatkārya-vāda) is unreasonable.[1] Nimbārka states once more another reason for the existence of the effect, thus : 'Śabdāntarāсca'. The other text is the text aptly teaching the pre-existence of the effect : Viz. "The existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning", which is other than the quoted text, viz., "The non-existent verily, was the beginning." Because of this too, it is the (Pre-) existent effect alone that originates,-this is the sense.[2]

The above-mentioned doctrine of existent effect (satkārya-vāda) is explained by the following illustrations. Such as : just as a piece of rolled up cloth, although not known to be a piece

---

1 Vedānt-kaustubha, 2.1.17,

2 Ibid., 2.1.17,

of cloth, does not, for that reason, become non-existent, but is indeed existent, existing in a different form, and when spread out once more is known to be a piece of cloth , just as the drawn forth limbs of a tortoise are not perceived, even though existent, but do not become non-existent there by and are known when stretched out again , just as the banyan tree, existent in the seed at all times indeed in a subtle form, is manifested in a gross form[1] , and just as the vital-breath, having the prāna, apāna and the rest, controlled by breath exercise etc , remains in its real form and when the control removed, is instantly known in those respective forms[2] So indeed prior to creation the *universe remains existent indeed, though not known to be a* universe, having its name and form unmanifest , and is clearly known as the universe at the time of creation, having its name and forms manifest[3] Thus, the cause and the effect are non-different Because, the effect-which belongs to posterior time, is present in the cause

Thus, it is established that the effect is non-different from the cause. Similarly, the Jīva-the effect or transformation of Brahman is non-different from Brahman-the cause

There is non-difference between Jīva and Brahman as between the whole and the part Jīva is the part of Brahman ; Brahman is the whole The relation of a part and the whole declares ; That there is difference between Jīva and Brahman, as well as non-difference Jīva is non-different from Brahman, on account of the designation of non-difference And its existence and activity are under the control of the whole The following are designation of non-difference :" 'Thou art that' 'This soul is Brahman', 'I am Brahman', and so on[4]

The non-difference between Jīva and Brahman is further

---

1 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 1.18,
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 1.19
3 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 1 18,
4 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha and Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 3 42

supported and expressed by Nimbārkācārya in the verse of Vedānta-kāmadhenu that all things are 'Brahmātmaka'.[1] This statement (brahmātmaka) indicates the non-difference of the three. Three means there are three realities viz. Brahman, Jīva and the world. So having Brahman for their essence (brahmātmaka), Jīva is non-different from Brahman, as the ear-ring is different from the bracelet in name and shape simply on account of kuṇḍalattva and kaṭakattva, but is also non-different, so far as gold is concerned.

Nevertheless, the authorities of śruti prove that Jīva is non-different from Brahman. " Existence alone my dear, was this in the beginning one only ; without a second', 'This one only was soul in the beginning', 'Thou art that', 'This soul is Brahman', 'That I am Brahman', "All this is, indeed, soul', "All this is Brahman, 'I am you indeed, O revered deity,' 'All this is verily Brahman for three from does it proceed, there in does it merge, and there by it is maintained.'"

To prove this statement of non-difference another ground is as follows. There is non-difference between Jīva and Brahman because the existence and activity of Jīva depend on Brahman (fadāyattasthitipravṛtikatvāt)[2]. As is clear from śruti, "The lord abides. O Arjuna : in the heart—region of all, causing all being to revolve by his mysterious power, as if mounted on a machine."[3] Moreover, whatever is depend on something else for its existence and activity, involves or Implies non-difference. It is said in the dialogue between the Vital-breath and the sense-organs in the chāndogya : "verily, they are not called speech, eyes, or mind, but called the vital breath alone."[4]

---

1 Sarvaṁ hi vijñānamato yathārthkaṁ
śrutismṛtibhyo nikhilasya vastunaḥ/
brahmātmaktvāditi vedavinmataṁ
trirūpatāpi śrutisūtrasādhitā/
—Vedānta-kāmadhenu, Verse 7.

2 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 89.

3 Gītā, 18.61.

4 Chāndogyopaniṣad, 5.1.15.

To makethis statement of non-difference clear the final ground is as follows : Jiva is non-different from Brahman because it is pervaded by Brahman (tadvyāpya).[1] Whatever is seen or heared in this world, internal or external, that all is pervaded be Nārāyana.

The Buddha Jīva is non-different from Brahman in essence, being His effect or transformation, on the other hand the Mukta Jīva is entirely non-different from Brahman, being existence-cognition-Bliss in essence (saccidānandsvarūpa). The freed Jīva attains the nature and qualities of the Brahman viz. the freedom from sins and so on.[2] The freed Jīva attains its-fathers and so on, through mere will.[3] It comes to have, the attributes of true desires and so on[4], and it becomes a self-ruler,[5] in accordance with the scriptural text", He becomes a self-ruler". Thus, freed Jīva is entirely non-different from Brahman.

3, *The Doctrine of Natural Difference and Non-difference (Svābhāvika-bhedābhedavāda)*

Thus, according to Nimbārka, the relation of Jiva and Brahman is just like that between a cause and its effect, a whole and its parts a substance and its attributes, a substratum of power and its powers. There is a relation of difference and non-difference between the cause and its effects as in ordinarry life. In ordinary life, the pots, dishes and the rest, having the lump of clay as their material cause ; bracelets, ear-rings and the rest, having gold as their material cause ; foams, waves and the rest, having the sea as their material cause ; and leaves, fruits and the rest, having the tree as their material cause, are all non-different from their respective causes but there is still a mutual difference amongst the particular effects themselves. Thus, there is neither pure non-difference (abeda) nor pure difference (bheda), between

---

1 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, pp. 89.
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 4.4.7.
3 Ibid., 4.4.8.
4 Ibid., 4.4.9.
5 Ibid.

the cause and its effect, but natural difference and non-difference. Again, just as pots, dishes and the rest are by nature non-different from the clay, as having no existence and activity apart from the clay, but they are by nature different, too, from the clay possessing as they do their own peculiar attributes which the clay lacks. And just as the bracelets, ear-rings and the rest are by nature non-different from the gold, as having no existenceand activity apart from the gold, but they are by nature different, too, from the gold possessing as they do their own peculiar attributes which the gold lacks. Likewise, there is a natural relation of difference and non-difference (svābhāvika-bhedābheda) between Jiva and Brahman.[1]

Although the saying, "Sarvaṁ khalvidaṁ brahma" (All this, indeed, is Brahman), declares that the non-sentient is non-different from Brahman, it is yet different from Brahman as its difference from Brahman is admitted by the phrase 'emanating from Him.' So, in the case of Jīva also, though the saying : "tattvamasi" (Thou art that), declares that the Jīva is non-different from Brahman as having no existence and activity independently of Brahman, it is yet different from Him, on account of the stated scriptural text designating difference. Thus, there is difference between Jīva and Brahman, despite there being a non-difference between two.[2] For example, stones like the diamond, the lapis lazuli, the ruby and the rest which are modification of the earth, though non-different from the earth as consisting in earth, are yet different from the earth, possessing, as they do their peculiar nature. And, just as the leaf, though non-different from the tree, is yet not the tree ; just as the ray, though non-different from its substratum, is yet different from it, so it is appropriate to hold that the Jiva is by nature different from Brahman, though it is at the sametime non-different from Him as having Him for its soul.[3]

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha and vedānta-kaustubha, 2.1.13.
2 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 2.1.21.
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha and vedānta-kaustubha 2.1.22.

Thus, it is established that the Jīva is neither absolutely different from Brahman, nor absolutely non-different from Him, but *there is a natural relation of difference and non-difference between* Jīva and Brahman as between the cause and its effects Again, the Jīva is entirely different from Brahman as it has already been observed But it, too, is non-different from Brahman in essence, being His effect or transformation

The natural relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman is further explained by Nimbārkācarya in such a sutra of Brahmasūtra as "amso nānāvyapadeśādanyathā cāpi dāśakītavaditvamadhiyata eka."[1] The Jīva is neither absolutely *different from the Brahman, nor absolutely non-different from Him, but it is a part of Brahman, and the Brahman is the* whole of the Jīva Here, a'part' means a 'power'. It should not be understood here as a portion, like a portion of wealth and the rest, because if it be like a portion of wealth there will result an absolute difference between Jīva and Brahman and hence the texts like . "Thou art that" will be set aside So, the true doctrine is that *there is a* natural relation of difference and non-*difference between Jīva and Brahman Thus, the Jiva is by* nature different from Brahman predicated to be the whole, and the store of attributes like omniscience and the rest-while it is predicated to be a part, as is subject to bondage and salvation But it is yet non-different from Brahman, as its existence and activity are under control of the whole There is a natural difference and non-difference between the Jīva and Brahman. "On account *of the designation of variety and otherwise" viz , on account of the designation of difference and non-difference. The following are designations of difference . " 'who controls the individual self* within,' 'Having entered within, the ruler of the people,' 'The soul, indeed is independent and possessed of more qualities, Jiva is less powerful, is dependent and is lowly,' 'The two unborn ones, the knower and the non-knower, the lord and the non-lord' " and so on The following are designations of non-

---

1 Brahma-sūtra, 2 3 42

difference : " 'Thou art that', 'this ātman is Brahman ;' 'I am Brahman' " and so on.[1]

The fact is that the cause and its effects, the part and the whole are neither absolutely different nor absolutely non-different, but the relation of difference and non-difference. That is, the relation of Jīva and Brahman is a relation of natural difference and non-difference (Svābhāvika bhedābheda).

To conclude present argument let me present the final evidence of the Brahma-sūtra : "ubhayavyapadesādahikuṇḍalavat"[2] viz., "But on account of the designation of both, like the case of serpent and its coil." In the present illustration 'ahikuṇḍalvat,' the serpent is material cause of the coil. The serpent is independent while coil is dependent. On one hand, this shows the difference between the serpent and its coil. On the other, the existence and activity of coil is impossible in the absence of the serpent. It proves the non-difference between the serpent and its coil. Thus, there is natural relation of difference and non-difference between the serpent and its coil as between the cause and its effects. Likewise, the Jīva is the effect or transformation of the Brahman. The relation of Jīva-the effect or transformation, with Brahman-the cause, in natural difference and non-difference on account of the designation of both difference and non-difference. The other analogy through which the Nimbārka trys to explain the situation is that of the sun and its rays[3] which means that it is true that there is difference between sun and its rays but there is also non-difference so far as the light is concerned.

Thus, there is a natural relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman in bondage.

On the other hand, there is natural relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman, in salvation, too. Thus, the freed Jīva is entirely non-different from the Brahman,

---

1 Vedānta-kaustubha 2.3.42.

2 Brahma-sūtra, 3.2.27.

3 Ibid., 3.2.28.

being existence-cognition-bliss in essence (saccidānandsvarūpa) But the freed Jīva, too, its different from the Brahman in two respects In the first place, the feed Jīva is atomic in size, while Brahman is all-pervasive And in the second place, the freed Jīva, however, though similar to the Brahman, yet cannot possibly be the lord of all the sentient and the non-sentient, their creator, their supporter, their destroyer, all-pervasive and so on, which Brahman possesses fully and eternally, as it has already been observed above

The relation between the freed Jīva and the Brahman is further remarked by Nimbārkācarya, as follows--'bhāgavirodhibhāgena *Jīva ātmānamanubhavati*' '*The freed Jīva* experiences itself as non-division, which is not opposed to *division*, or as being both *different and non-different* at the same time, from the Brahman. Here again, Srīnivāsācārya, explains as follows: the freed Jīva, freed from all fetters, realizes itself as non-divided or no-distinct from the Highest self, the Highest person Why ? "On account of *being seen" that is*, because *at the time* (*viz during salvation*) the Highest self, the soul of all, is intuited by the freed Jīva Through the influence of nescience, the individual soul comes to have a pervese notion about itself. But, when through the influence of the repeated practice of hearing, thinking, and *meditating, the Highest lord is intuited, all the obstacles to the* real knowledge regarding the real nature of itself as well as the highest self immediately destroyed in accordance with the scriptual text, "The knot of the heart is broken, all doubts are cut off, and all his works perish when he who is high and low is seen " Hence, there can be no doubt what-so-ever that the *freed Jīva a part of the Lord, having intuited the soul of all, the whole, realizes, itself, all the more clearly, as non-distinct from* Him The individual soul, having Him for its essence, has no distinction from Him, and hence in spite of a distinction of nature between the individual soul and Brahman, there is still a non-distinction between them, a non-distinction which is compatible with distinction-just as there is between an attribute and

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 4 4 4

its substratum. Again, Śrīnivāsācārya says that we do not mean to say that there is any non-distinction of nature between the soul and the Lord, otherwise in accordance with scriptural and smṛti texts like: "The existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning, one only and without a second," "All this, verily, is Brahman", "Vāsudeva is everything", "Know everything Kṛṣṇa, the movable and the immovable, all souls and the universe is Kṛṣṇa", there must be a non-distinction of nature between the non-sentient and the Lord too, or-because scripture is found to refer to distinction and non-distinction. It is established that the freed Jīva realizes itself as non-distinct from the Brahman which non-distinction is compatible with distinction.[1]

Thus, it is established that there is natural relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman in salvation.

According to Nimbārka, therefore, there is natural relation of difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman in bondage as well as in salvation. It is further supported by Śrīnivāsācārya, according to whom the fact is that even during the bondage (baddhāvasthā) the Jīva, which is atomic in size and possesses little knowledge, though different from the Brahman, who is all-pervading, non-straying in nature and omniscient, yet like the leaf from the tree, the ray from the lamp, quality from the qualified, sense-organs from the vital-air, its existence and activities being dependent upon the Brahman, it is non-different from the Brahman. Likewise, though in salvation (muktāvasthā) the Jīva is non-different from Brahman, it having no separate independent existence and activity, at the same time, it is undoubtedly different from Brahman, in accordance with the śruti "Svena rūpena sampadyate"-"It realizes its own nature." Otherwise, the nature of both, the Jīva and the Brahman becomes loose.[2]

---

1 (a) Vedānta-kaustubha, 4.4.4,
(b) Tattvaprakaśikā of Keśava Kaśamīrī,
—Commentary on Śrīmadbhagavatagītā, Hindi Translation by 'Śrī Kalika Singh, Bardhaman, 1935, pp. 101-102.

2 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 1.4.22.

Thus, the doctrine of natural difference and non-difference is real, and eternal And again, it establishes that in the doctrine of natural difference and non-difference (Svābhāvika-bhedābheda-vāda) of Nimbārkācārya, there is no such contradiction as we find in some other's doctrines such as the follower of the doctrine of only difference (bhedavāda), has to accept many texts like "All this indeed is Brahman", as subordinate ones, and the followers of the doctrine of only non-difference (abhedavāda) have to accept many texts, which determine difference, as subordinate ones

4

NATURE OF JĪVA AND BRAHMAN AS CONCERNED WITH THEIR RELATION

1. *Nature of the Jīva*

Jīva is the only sentient reality. Śrī Nimbārkācārya has given the following characteristics of the Jīva in his Vedānta-kāmadhenu :

> "Jñānasvarūpaṁ ca hareradhīnaṁ,
> śarīrasaṁyogaviyogayogyaṁ /
> Aṇuṁ hi Jīvaṁ pratidehabhinnaṁ,
> jñātṛtvavantaṁ yadanantamāhuḥ // [Verse 1]

(The Jīva is knowledge by nature, dependent on Hari and capable to be associated with and dissociated from a body ; atomic, different in different bodies ; and a knower and infinite).

(A) The Jīva is knowledge[1] by nature. It is a special quality of the Jīva, which delights the entire body, just as the odour of the flower. As proved by the śruti : "He has entered here up to the body-hairs and finger-nails.[2] "On account of this special quality of the Jīva, it is different from the non-sentient, viz., the body, the sense-organs (eleven in number), the vital breath (with its five modes), the mind and buddhi.[3]

Being the essence of the Jīva, knowledge is present in every state, viz. the states of walking, dream, deep sleep, swoon and death. It is present even in the state of deep sleep and the rest.

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 26 and Vedānta-Kāmadhenu, Verse 1.

2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 26.

3 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 4.

An objection may be raised here where is it present during the state of deep sleep, as it is present during the state of walking? The answer to this question is as follows It is manifested during the walking state and is in its own possession (self-possessed) during the state of deep sleep. Just as youth is present even in child-age, though it is not manifested in child-age, yet is manifested in young age [1]

The Jīva being a knowledge, is a knower[2] as well

An objection may be raised here . the Jīva cannot be both knowledge and knower. Just as one drop of water is identical with water[3], so knowledge is identical with knower. Here, *the Jīva is not a knower, but pure knowledge.*

To this the answer is as follows . there is not contradiction[4] between knowledge and knower, and are not in identity with each other. In many cases, we find that the substratum (dharmin) and the attribute (dharma) are very similar, but that does not mean that they are identical Just as a gem and its rays are equally luminous, yet they are different and they stand in the relation of substratum (dharmin) and attribute (dharma) [5] Similarly, though the Jīva and its quality of knowledge are equally knowledge, yet they stand in relation of substratum and attribute, so there is distinction between them, and there is no identity, as is clear from the scripture· "Seated on the body by knowledge "[6] Thus, there is difference between one drop of water and water, for that drop of water, having a distinct form, must be different from other drops of water [7]

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 3. 30
2 Ibid, 1 2 12, 1. 3. 5, 2 3 18
3 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p 4.
4 Ibid
5 Ibid.
6 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 3 27.
7 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p 5.

The Jīva being a knower, is an Ego or 'I' (*ahaṁ*).[1] A knower always feels 'I know', 'I want', 'I do', etc.[2] 'Ahamartha' does not consist of two factors, one intelligence and the other non-intelligence.[3] It is not unreal butis the essence of the Jīva.

It is objected here, that if an Ego or 'I' is real or the essence of the Jīva, it must always exist along with it. But the 'I' no longer exists in the state of deep sleep, salvation etc. so, the 'I' is an effect of prakṛti.[4]

The answer to this question is as follows : The 'I' is present even in deep sleep, as is proved from such memory as "For hsuc a long time I slept happily and did not know anything". It shows, the 'I' is present even in deep sleep as the substratum of knowledge and the feeling of happiness. Even the memory "For such a long time I did not know even myself", does not show the absence of 'I' during the state of deep sleep. But it means that it is present even in deep sleep, what is absent is the 'I' as it is during the walking state. Hence, the 'I' must persist even during the states of deep sleep, swoon and the rest.[5]

The Jīva, being an Ego, is a doer.[6] It is proved by all spiritual injunctions : for example : "one who desires to go to svarg should perform sacrifices", or "one who desires salvation should worship the Brahman".[7] On account of its movement it is a doer as declared by Śruti : "The Jīva moves, within the body at will",[8] or "Thus, moves taking the vital breath."[9] This also proves that the Jīva is a doer. It means

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 18.
2 Vedānt-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 7.
3 Dvayanśatāpi na ca bhāti cetanānām pratitivisayehamarthake —Sarviśeṣa-Nirviśeṣa-Kṛṣṇastavarāja, Verse 21.
4 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 7.
5 Ibid., p. 8.
6 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 34
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid., 2. 3. 33.
9 Ibid., 2. 3. 34.

that the Jīva is a material cause, being a knower and enjoyer as far as possible, of the vital breath, the sense organs and the buddhi etc. The sentence that, "Vijñāna performs sacrifice,"[1] also proves that the Jīva is a doer Here one might ask does not 'vijñāna' mean 'buddhi' ? To this our reply would be No ; because buddhi is not the doer itself but is an impelling force The fact is that the Jīva is only a doer

An objection may be raised here, if the Jīva is only a doer, it must always do only pure actions from which it could get only pleasure, but why does it do impure actions ? The answer to this question is as follows

There is no law governing the fruits of the past deeds The Jīva does its actions impelled by past deeds, and at that time it does not know about purity or impurity of deeds So, even though a doer, the Jīva is ruled by the deeds[2] If we accept that buddhi is the doer, then what will be the impelling power for the doer, which is a necessity ? So, the Jīva is only a doer[3]

The Jiva does its actions as it desires just as a carpenter does his work or does not do his work as he desires This agreement is possible in the Jīva, but is not possible in the buddhi So buddhi is not the doer,[4] the Jīva is the only doer

The Jīva is a doer not only during the state of mundane existence, but also in its state of salvation As is clear from the fact that it performs the Samādhi[5] It is a doer

The Jiva is an enjoyer or bhoktā[6] It is proved from such memory of deep sleep "For such a long time I slept happily,"

---

1 Vedānta-pārijata-saurabha, 2 3 35
2 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 2 3 36
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 3 37.
4 Ibid , 2 3 39
5 Ibid , 2 3. 38.
6 Ibid , 1 3. 7, 3. 2 13.

and it enjoys supreme bliss produced from its direct vision of Brahman during the salvation-state.[1] Thus it continues to be so during deep sleep and salvation.

The Jīva, being the knower, the doer, the enjoyer it could be said that the Jīva must be like the Brahman. To this doubt the siddhānti replies that, it is not independent, but is dependent on Hari[2] and its activity, existence, knowledge, enjoyment everything is dependent on Brahman. For example : the earthen jar is of the nature of clay, hence the existence and the activity of the jar is dependent on clay. It is proved by śruti. "Entered within, the controller of men".[3] Whatever the Lord, who has regard for the works done by the Jīva, makes it do good deeds and the rest in another birth too, on account of the futility of what is enjoined and what is prohibited.[4] Even when it attains similarity to Brahman during the state of salvation, it remains under his control.

The Jīva is without birth and death-eternal.[5] But, according to prima-facie view that "Devadutta is born and dead" so the Jīva is born and dies. It is only figurative, there is no birth and death of the Jīva, and it implies only that the material body is born or dies. In the presence of an existence of body, it is (its birth and death) natural. So the Jīva is neither born nor does it die, it is eternal (aja) as declared by the scripture itself : A wise man is neither born nor dies, Eternal among the eternal, An unborn one, indeed, lies by enjoying." It is also proved by Smṛti "unborn, eternal, constant and ancient he is not killed when the body is killed."

The Jīva is a part of Brahman.[6] Here, the 'part' means

1 Vedānta-ratna-mañjuṣā, p. 12.
2 Vedānta-Kāmadhenu, Verse 1.
3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 40.
4 Ibid,, 2. 3. 41.
5 Ibid., 2. 3. 16-17.
6 Ibid., 2. 3. 42.

'power'.[1] It means Jīva is power of Brahman "All the beings are a foot of the Lord"[2] it also proves that the Jiva is a part of Brahman It is also proved by Smṛti "Just my part, the Jīva came in the world of mortals as the eternal "[3]

Here it may be asked the Jīva is a part of Brahman, so Brahman must experience pleasure and pain like the Jīva To this objection, it is said that the Jiva experiences pleasure and pain under the influence of its past deeds, but Brahman does not experience any such feeling, just as the defects of light, which is the part, do not affect the sun, who is the whole [4]

Thus, in nature the Jīva is knowledge, a knower, a doer and an enjoyer, under the control of Brahman and a also part of the Brahman all these things are true of the Jiva in bondage as well as in salvation.

(B) The size of the Jīva is very minute (atomic or anuparimāṇa)[5] If we accept the medium size, the Jīva will also be perishable like the jar. The followers of this siddhānt accept the size of the Jīva according to the size of the body. Thus, the size of the soul of an elephant will be as huge as the body of the elephant The size of the intelligence of an ant will be as small as the body of an ant This will create the following difficulty

When the intelligence of an elephant will obtain the body of an ant, or, when the intelligence of an ant will obtain the body of an elephant, it will be rather impossible for both of them to enter into the body of one another Hence the outlook of the Maddhyam parimānavadin cannot be accepted [6]

The all-pervading size of the Jiva is also defective If we

1 Vedanta-Kaustubha, 2 3 42
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 3 43
3 Ibid , 2 3 44
4 Ibid , 2 3 45
5 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2 3 19 and Vedānta Kāmadhenu, Verse 1
6 Vedānta-Kaustubha, 2 3 19

accept the all-pervading size, then the utkrānti (going of the soul out of the body), gati (going of the soul to the higher worlds, like moon, etc.) and āgati (return of the soul from other worlds in this world) of the Jīva should not occur, because the all-pervading entity cannot move. Only supreme Brahman is of the nature of all-pervasiveness. Hence the outlook of vibhuparimāṇavādin cannot be accepted.[1]

Consequently, we have to accept the size of the Jīva as the most minute one (aṇu). This is from the text : "This soul goes out through the eye, or through the head, or through other parts of the body." "Whoever, go forth from this world all go to the moon alone." "Returning from that world to this world for action," and so on.[2] This is clearly declared by the scripture as well which says : ,'The Jīva is as subtle as a hair-point divided and subdivided hundreds of times."[3]

Here it may be asked : the Jīva being atomic how can it experience the feelings of pleasure and pain of the entire body ? To this, we reply : Just as a drop of sandal wood-paste in one part of the body can soothe and enlighten the entire body, so, the Jīva, though it occupies only a point in the body, enlightens the entire body and experiences the feelings of pleasure and pain of the entire body.[4]

Further, it may be objected : The example of sandal wood-paste is not suitable, on account of the speciality of residence. To this objection, we reply : The Jīva, too, dwells into heart, viz., in one part of the body : does not dwell everywhere as a consciousness, just as the sandal wood-paste.[5]

---

1 Vedānta Kaustubha, 2. 3. 19, 2. 3. 21.
2 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 19.
3 (a) Ibid., 2. 3. 22.
(b) Joshi, Rasik Vihari : 'A Note on the Doctrine of Non-difference in Difference of Nimbārka', East and West, Vol. 15, No.2, January 1964, March 1965, ISMEO, Rome.
4 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 3. 23.
5 Ibid., 2. 3. 24.

Thus, the Jīva is atomic in size, in bondage as well as in salvation [1]

(C) The Jīva is innumerable in number The Ekajīvavādin admits only Jīva in the universe None has, so far, attained final liberation Whenever that one Jīva will be liberated, the whole world will disappear

To refute this doctrine, Nimbārkācārya propounded that in each body the Jīva is a separate being limited by that body [2] It proves that in all the beings Brahman is one but Jīva is separate and infinite Both Brahman and Jīva are possessed of mutual distinguishing marks In case, we do not accept a separate Jīva in each body, then all the individual souls should sleep after the sleeping of one, and all should be unconscious when one becomes unconscious Similarly, when one feels happy or unhappy all should feel alike This never happens Hence the outlook of Ekajīvavādin cannot be accepted [3]

Nevertheless the scriptural injunctions prove that the Jīva is not one (endless) It is many while Brahman is one There is a great difference by nature between the Jīva and Brahman In the passage "He who staying in the self, internally controls the self, He is the immortal self, eternal of all the eternals, animate of all animates, and being one without a second makes many desires "[4] In evidence, all the three epithets, nityānām, cetanānām, bahunām, prove that the self is endless The Brahma-sūtra states that the Brahman in Jīva, who is śarīrābhimānin, is different by nature [5] It also establishes that Brahman is different

---

1 Vedānta Kaustubha, 4 4 15

2 Pratidehabhinnam—Vedānta Kāmadhenu, Verse 1

3 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūsā, p 19

4 Ya ātmani tiṣṭhan ātmānāmantaro yamayati /
eṣa tu ātmānan-taryāmyāmṛtah //
nityo nityānām cetanaścetanānām /
Eko bahūnām yo vidadhāti kāmān//—Kathaka Up , II, 2 13

5 Bhedavyapadeśāccānyah

—Brahmasūtra

from Jīva.[1] The omniscient and omnipotent ultimate reality is definitely superior to the Jīva. The Bhagavatgītā also remarks : "O Arjuna ! It is not true that I was present before, I, you, and all these kings are never present in present, past and future."[2] In this way the natural difference between Brahman and Jīva is strongly established.

When we accept infinite Individual souls, the question is that by propitiation one by one each individual soul will attain the final liberation and a stage will come when all the individual souls will attain *mukti.* and the creation will come to an end. The answer of this question is explicitly given by Nimbārkācārya in the course of the definition of the Jīva under the words 'yadananta-māhuḥ' The Jīva is innumerable and endless, will never come to an end. The whole of the universe is full of the beings who have gross, subtle, and minute bodies.[3]

(D) There are broadly speaking two kinds of the Jīva, viz. Baddha and Mukta.[4]

(i) *Baddha*, that is, one who is pointed out by the term 'unborn one' (aja), eternal by nature, carried away by the current of beginningless deeds,[5] and devoid of a true knowledge of the real nature of itself or of the supreme being. One who has identified itself through nescience with the body of a god, or of a

1 Adhikaṁ tu bhedanirdeśāt

—Brahmasūtra, 2.1.21

2 Na tvevāhaṁ jātu nāśaṁ na tvam neme janādhipaḥ /
na caiva na bhavisyāmaḥ sarve vayamataḥ paraṁ //

—Gītā, 2. 12.

3 (A) Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p. 19.
(B) Joshi, Rasik Vihari : 'A Note on the Doctrine of Non-difference in Difference of Nimbārka', "East and West", Vol. 15, No. 1-2., Jan. 1964, March 1965, ISMEO, Rome.

4 Muktaṁ ca baddhaṁ kila baddhamuktaṁ /
Prabhedabāhulyamathaiṣu bodhyaṁ //

—Vedānta-Kāmadhenu, Verse 2.

5 Anādimāyāpariyuktarūpaṁ /
tvenamvidurvai bhagavat-prasādāt //

—Vedānta Kāmadhenu 4. 2

man, or of any other being, who is a modification of prakrti, and is experiencing sounds and the rest, the parts of prakrti, and is devoid of the supreme bliss[1] Baddhas are of two kinds, viz Mumuksus and bubhukṣus Mumuksus, again, are of two kinds, viz, bhagavatabhāvāpatti and nijasvarūpāpatti, bubhuksus are of two kinds, viz bhāviśreyaskah and nityasamsārī[2]

(ii) *Mukta*, that is, one who has attained fortunately the grace of the Lord through his poor and pitiable condition, and has attained the supreme bliss through the practice of hearing, thinking and meditating of the vedanta by attending upon the feet of his Guru[3] and who refuses prakrti[4] Muktas are of two kinds, viz, nityamuktas and muktas Nityamuktas, again, are of two kinds, viz, Ānantaryya and pārsada, muktas are of two kinds, viz, bhagavatabhāvāpatti and nijasvarūpāpatti[5]

The characteristics of the Baddha and the Mukta Jīva are very much the same That is, like the Baddha-Jiva, the Mukta-Jīva also is knowledge by nature and a knower, a doer, an enjoyer, atomic and infinite Hence, although the characteristics of a Baddha and a Mukta-Jiva are apparently the same, really these are not so It is undoubtedly true, that a Mukta-Jiva too, is knowledge by nature, a knower, a doer, an enjoyer, atomic and infinite, yet it is entirely different from a Baddha-Jīva, because it is all the above in an entirely different sense[6]

---

1 Vedānta-kaustubha, 1 4 10

2 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, p 22

3 Joshi, Rasik Vihari (A) "A Note on Guru, Dīksā, and Mantra" : Ethnos, Stockoholm (Sweden), 1972
(B) Catuhślokī or Saptaślokī Bhāgavata ·
A critical study, Purānam, Vol XVI, No 1 January 1974, Varanasi

4 Vedānta-kaustubha, 1 4 10

5 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, pp 22-23

6 Chaudhuri Dr (Mrs) Roma, "Nimbārka's Theory of Self" 'Finite-Self', Ed by Swami, B H Bon Maharaj, Vrindavan, 1963

2. *Nature of Brahman*

In the philosophy of Nimbārka, the absolute ultimate reality is Śrīkṛṣṇa himself. He is denoted by the term "Brahman", who has inherent nature, attributes, powers and so on.[1] He is Lord of cause of causes. He is controller of all. He is Lord of all.[2] He is variously known as: Kṛṣṇa, Harī, Ramākānta, Puruṣottama, Keśava, Mādhava, Bhagawān, etc.[3] and on his left side the daughter of Vṛṣabhânu (Rādhikā) is illuminated with a corresponding beauty, who is attended on by thousands of female friends and who is the giver of all desired objects.[4] This concept of Brahman has been clearly explained by Śrīnīmbārkācārya in the following verse of Vedānta-kāmadhenu (Daśaślokī):

Svabhāvatopāstasamastadoṣa-
maśeṣakalyāṇaguṇaikarāśim /
vyuhāṅginaṁ *brahma* paraṁ vareṇyaṁ
dhyayem kṛṣṇaṁ kamalekṣaṇaṁ hariṁ /

—*Vedānta-kāmadhenu*, Verse 4.

(I meditate on the Supreme Brahman, viz. *Kṛṣṇa, Harī, who* has eyes like the lotus, who naturally has destroyed all the defects, is the store of all auspicious attributes. Whose body is represented by the vyūha and who is attended by all).

(A) By nature, Brahman has destroyed all the defects, viz., the five kinds of kleśas such as: avidyā (nescience), asmitā (egoism), rāga (passion), dveṣa (aversion), abhiniveśa (the will-to-live). These kleśas are denoted by the words: tama, moha, mahāmoha, tāmisra, andhatāmisra. Tama (nescience) covers the real nature of things, moha is confounding the body with the soul, mahāmoha is that which hankers after enjoyment, tāmisra, viz.,

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 1. 1, Vedānta Kāmadhenu, Verse 4.

2 Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 3. 4. 22.

3 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, Saviśeṣa-Nirviśeṣa kṛṣṇa-stavarāj, —Vedānta Kāmadhenu.

4 Vedānta-Kāmadhenu, Verse 5.

Malice, andhatāmisra, viz. death He is absolutely free from the six kinds of modifications (vikāras) such as birth, existence, growth, transformation, decay and death He is free from three gunas, viz, sattva, raja, and tama Nevertheless, the authorities of the śruti prove that he is free from all sins, without old age, without death, without grief, without hunger, without thirst He has true desires, and true volitions" "He is not affected by the deeds, kleśas (hindrances), fruitions of karma (vipāka) and so on "[1]

On the other hand, He is endowed with all the auspicious attributes and qualities like knowledge, power, strength, sovereignty, energy, valour, sausīlya, vātsalya, mārdava, ārjava, sauhārda, etc Knowledge—the direct perception of all space, time and objects, power—the capacity of making the impossible; strength—the power of supporting the entire universe, sovereignty—the power of controlling everything, energy—tirelessness inspite of continued and unlimited labour, valour—the capacity of defeating all without being ever defeated by them These six qualities of Brahman help him in creating the universe Sauśīlya—to be connected with all without considering the lowliest and the most unworthy, inspite of his own greatness, vātsalya—never looking at the faults of His devotees ; mārdava--non-endurance of the miseries of those who are dependent on Him, ārjava—the perfectness of mind and speech , Sauharda—the diligence to protect others , Sarvaśaranya or somya—being the place of refuge of all , kārunya—the nature of destroying the faults of others, sthiratva—remaining steady in wars, dhairya—maintaining promises, dayā—feeling grieved at the grief of others without any cause, and being desirous of removing their griefs , mādhurya—having sweetness like the nectar etc All these qualities of Brahman help Him in the protection of those who are dependent on Him[2]

The Lord is all blissful and is the source of bliss to all Jīvas

---

1 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, pp 43 44, Vedānta-pārijātā-saurabha, 3 2 11, 30

2 Vedānta-ratnamañjūsā, pp 44 45, Vedānta-pārijata saurabha, 1 2 2

His bliss is unlimited.[1] Through His bliss, He desires to be many and creates the universe.[2] As declared by śruti, "He desired : may I be many and may I procreate. He created all this."[3]

The Lord has a physical body upon which those desirous of salvation meditate. Meditation, too, is possible only if the Lord has a body.[4] Śruti speaks also that the Lord has physical body. "The person who is seen within the sun, having a golden beard, having golden hair etc."[5] The person who is seen in the eyes,"[6] and so on.

Brahman is denoted by the words such as : Ether, vital—breath, light, Gāyatrī metre, etc.[7] He has spiritual body[8], the śruti speaks also,"spiritual, having the vital—breath for the body, of the form of light, having true volitions etc.[9] He is the eater of the movable and the immovable.[10] He is great and all-pervasive.[11] He is the object to be worshipped and the object to be known.[12] This Lord is the immortal, the fearless, this is Brahman.[13] He is all happiness,[14] He is the controller of all, is the seer of all, is the inner controller.[15] He is invisible and omniscient.[16] *He is im-*

1 Ibid., 1. 3. 9.
2 Ibid., 1. 1. 17.
3 Taittirīyopaniṣad, 2. 61.
4 Vedānta-kaustubha, 1. 1. 21.
5 Chāndogyopaniṣad, 1. 6. 6.
6 Ibid., 1. 7. 5.
7 Vedānta-pārijāta saurabha, 1. 1 23-31.
8 Ibid., 1. 2. 2.
9 Chāndogyopaniṣad, 3. 14. 2.
10 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 2. 9.
11 Ibid., 1. 2 10.
12 Ibid., 1. 2. 12.
13 Ibid., 1. 2. 13.
14 Ibid., 1. 2. 15.
15 Ibid., 1. 2. 19-20.
16 Ibid., 1. 2. 22.

perishable, is all-pervading[1] His nature is everpresent and is the cause of the appearance of the nature of Jīva[2] Brahman is the omniscient, omnipotent[3] It is known by all creation, viz movable and immovable He is the whole of Jīva[4] He is the maker of all which are seen in dream and are indicative of pure and impure fruits[5] Through His desire the Jīva's bondage and salvation arise, as declared by *śruti* "The cause of the world, bondage, abiding and salvation[6] Brahman is not enjoyer.[7] Though he is abiding within all sentient and non-sentient, yet He is not touched by their defects, is endowed with His all auspicious attributes, just as the sun, reflected on different *water-houses, does not participate in the defects of their increase and decrease As śruti speaks* "He is not smeared with the misery of the world "[8] Brahman is unmanifest. "He is not perceivable through the eyes nor by speach, and so on,"[9] but He becomes manifest through the loving devotion and meditation Just as there is manifestation of the sun, fire and like through the repetition of the means resorted to by those who long for them As declared by *śruti* and *smrti* "He, with his nature purified through the clarification of the knowledge of Brahman, perceives, meditating him who is without parts", and "O Arjuna, I may be known through exclusive devotion, and, O paramatapa perceived in truth, and entered through exclusive devotion "[10] Brahman is unlimited, but He becomes limited for those devotees who meditate Him, just as the lusture of the sun through a window[11]

---

1 Ibid, 1 2 23, 1 3 10
2 Ibid, 1 3 19-20
3 Ibid, 1 4 14
4 Ibid, 2 3 42
5 Ibid, 3 2 4, 7
6 Ibid, 3 2 5
7 Ibid, 3 2 13
8 Ibid, 3 2 11, 20, 30
9 Ibid, 3 2 23
10 Ibid, 3 2 24 25
11 Ibid, 3 2 32-34

ıman alone is the giver of fruits of all deeds in accordance particular duties to which they are entitled.[1]

Thus, by nature Brahman has destroyed all the defects and is owed with all attributes and qualities.

(B) Brahman is the cause of the universe.[2] Brahman alone ie cause of the creation and destruction of the universe. All ies and forms arise from Him and return to Him[3].

Brahman is both material cause and efficient cause ādāna and nimitta kāraṇa) of the universe.[4] As declared by śruti : Brahman was the forest, Brahman the tree from ich they cut off the heaven and the earth. O learned man, ask ough the mind whereon it stood supporting the worlds."[5] It is material cause in the sense that it enables its natural śaktis pacity, viz., the cit and the acit in their subtle forms, to bemaniited in gross forms; and it is the efficient cause in the sense that unites the individual souls with their respective fruits of actions d means of enjoyments. Thus, the creation of the universe is thing but a manifestation in a gross form of what was subtle fore and is thus a sort of modification or pariṇāma.[6]

Pariṇāma means modification or transformation or actual iange, resulting in an effect having equal reality with the iaterial cause, or, production of an effect that has same kind of ither real or unreal) existence as that of its material cause. The xample of the transformation of milk into curds is often quoted. n this school of thought, there is entire modification of the ubstance, name and form of the cause. The change of the ause is real. The relation between the cause and the effect is that of difference and non-difference. The cause itself assumes the shape of the effect. In reality, both are real. The milk itself

1 Ibid., 3. 2. 38.
2 Ibid., 1. 1. 10-12, 19, 2. 1. 35, 2. 3. 8, 13.
3 Ibid., 1. 3. 42.
4 Ibid., 1. 4. 23-27.
5 Ibid., 1. 4, 25.
6 Ghate, V. S., The Vedānta, p. 28, Poona, 1960.

changes into curds, the effect in the cause in the form of the cause or the śakti is accepted. It established the relation of difference and non-difference between the cause and the effect [1]

Parināma has been divided into two kinds [2]

(i) Svarūpa-pariṇāma as of the sāṁkhya system (ii) śakti-vikṣepa-lakṣana-pariṇām. Nimbārkācārya admits the Brahma-Kāraṇavāda or the Brahmaśaktikāraṇavāda [3] According to him the Universe exists in the Brahman in unmanifest form or identical form or in the form of potency (śakti) because it becomes manifested as before In this view the relation between the universe and Brahman is that of difference—non-difference such as the case of gold and ornaments [4]

Several objections may be raised against the causality of Brahman The most important and very natural one is · why should Brahman who has all His desires eternally fulfilled create this universe ?[5]

To this question, Nimbārka replies : The creation of Brahman is the mere sport, just like, the mere sport of kings. In ordinary life, the play of an emperor, who has attained sovereignty, with various kinds of dice, wooden balls, etc is a mere sport without any desire for fruit, so Brahman creates the world in mere sport without any need [6]

The second objection, which leads to the above, is no less natural If the Lord creates this universe in mere sport, then why is there unequality in the universe ? Why is one rich and the other poor, one happy and the other unhappy, etc., why is it so ? It means the Lord is not all merciful, but is cruel

---

1 Joshi, Rasik Vihari, "The Role of Indian Logic in the Doctrine of Causality", Melangs D' Indianisme a la Mémoire De Louis Renou, Paris, 1968

2 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2 1 26, p 169

3 Vedānta-Pārijāta-saurabha, 1 4 26

4 Joshi, Rasik Vihari : "The Role of Indian Logic in the Doctrine of Causality", Paris, 1968

5 Vedānta-Pārijāta-saurabha, 2 1 31

6 Ibid , 2 1 32

Hence Nimbārka replies : Unequality and cruelty of unequal creation and destruction, etc. depend on the deeds of the Jīva, just as the cloud in producing different kinds of shoots depends on their respective seeds. So the śruti : "One becomes good by good deeds, bad by bad deeds." Thus, Brahman is not responsible for the miseries and various lots of Jīva. Jīva is itself responsible through its own deeds.[1]

It may be said that it is not just or right that Brahman should give the fruits of deeds in accordance with the deeds of Jīva, as there was no difference between Jīva and Brahman prior to creation. As declared by śruti, "The existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning." So, unequality and cruelty of unequal creation depend on the Lord.[2]

It is not so because the creation is beginningless. He creates the universe in accordance with the deeds of Jīva, which has been done by the individual souls in the previous creation. A subsequent creation cannot arise all of a sudden, so it depends on a prior creation. It is clear from śruti : "The creater formed the sun and moon as he did before," and so on.[3]

One or two objections will be considered against this doctrine that Brahman is the creator of the world. It is to be objected ; Brahman is not the material cause of the universe, because there is difference between Brahman and the world. Brahman possesses the attributes of sentience, while the world possesses just the opposite attributes of non-sentience and it is the rule, whatever is different from something has not that for its material cause, just as the pot, which is different from the ether has not the ether as its material cause.[4]

But Nimbārka points out, there is no rule that there will be

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 2. 1. 33.
2 Ibid., 2. 1. 34.
3 Ibid., 2. 1. 34.
4 Vedānta-kaustubha, 2. 1. 4.

a similarity between a material cause and its effect in every respect. So it cannot be said that the world, being different from Brahmam, cannot arise from Him As śruti says "There is the origin of hairs on the head and so on from a person from whom they are different, and of scorpions from the cowdung from which they are different [1]"

An objection is raised Brahman is not the material cause of the world in dissolution, because, Brahman, the cause, like the effect, viz the world, will be non sentient [2]

The answer to this question is as follows Just as the evolutes like the pot, when dissolved, do not defile the lump of clay with their own attributes, so this world, consisting of non sentient, when dissolved into Brahman, does not defile Brahman, possessing the non-sentient as His power [3]

It may be objected Brahman is the material cause of the universe, then He Himself will experience the pleasures and pains in the form of Jīva, so that there will be no difference between the enjoyer (viz the Jiva) and the controller [4]

The answer to this is as follows Just as, in ordinary life, though foams, waves and the rest, having the sea as their material cause, are all non-different from their respective causes, there is still a mutual difference amongst the particular effects themselves In the same manner there may be a mutual difference between the enjoyer and the controller, although they are non-different from Brahman, having Brahman as their material cause The fact, however, is, according to Nimbārka, that there is difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman

Thus, we conclude that according to Nimbārka Brahman is

1 Vedānta-pārijata-saurabha, 2 1 6
2 Ibid , 2 1 8
3 Ibid , 2 1 9
4 Ibid , 2 1 13

both the material cause and the efficient cause of the universe and its soul. And Nimbārka, like that of the Sāṁkhya, is the upholder of Satkāryavāda.

The most important and natural question is raised. What is the proof of the existence of Brahman ? The answer to this is as follows : Scripture alone is the source of knowing Brahman.[1]

---

1 Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, 1. 1. 3.

5

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE RELATION OF JĪVA & BRAHMAN ON THE BASIS OF VARIOUS SCHOOLS OF VEDĀNTA

1. *Śaṅkara and Nimbārka*

The doctrine of Sankara is called "Kevalādvaita" or 'absolute monism' According to Sankara, there is no natural difference between Jiva and Brahman Brahman *is the only reality*, and pervades all being which have only apparent existence The plurality of individuals is false He emphasives this point again and again He accepts, therefore, Jīva and Brahman are absolutely identical, that is referred to in the upanisads The saying, "Tat-tvam-asi", *means that* Jiva *is non-different* from Brahman, or Jīva and Brahman are absolutely indentical This is the establishing sentence of the identity of Jīva and Brahman, but this meaning is not reasonable, because there are many contradictory attributes in Jiva and Brahman Jīva is atomic, has little knowledge, while Brahman is omniscient and all-pervading and so on In this sense, there cannot be an identity between the Jiva and Brahman What is the exact meaning of this Mahāvākya ? In Saṁkarite philosophy, this mahāvākya is *interpreted by "Bhāgavṛttilakṣnā" An identity judgment* like "This is that Devadatta" makes clear the above point "This is that Devadatta" refers to the identity of the individual in spite of differences in respect of time, place and circumstance An individual who was seen previously at a certain place, is seen today at a different place under different circumstance When we say that he is the same man we overlook the unessential differences and emphasize the essential identity Similar is the case with the identity taught between the Jīva and Brahman Jīva and Brahman, in spite of the difference in their adjuncts, are identical in so far as their real self is concerned Thus, Jiva,

is absolutely identical with Brahman. Here, Śaṅkara fundamentally differs from Nimbārka. According to Nimbārka philosophy, in the interpretation of the Mahāvākya "Tat-tvam-asi", Jīva is non-different from Brahman, which non-difference is compatible with a difference between them.

Thus, Nimbārka's doctrine is completely different from Śaṅkara's doctrine. In Śaṅkarite philosophy, non-difference means "absolute identity", while in the philosophy of Nimbārka, non-difference is compatible with difference. And again, Śaṅkara's doctrine has no place for difference, which is only 'vyāvahārika', but, for Nimbārka, both difference and non-difference are on the same level, real and compatible.

2. *Rāmānuja and Nimbārka*

Rāmānuja explains the relation of Jīva and Brahman on the analogy of the substance-attribute (Viśeṣyaviśeṣaṇa), or soul-body relation (Śarīrīśarīra sambandha).

In the first place Rāmānuja has described the relation of Jīva and Brahman as similar to the relation between a substance and its attribute[2]. Brahman is only independent reality. Jīva is dependent on it. Jīva and Brahman do not exist separately, but, like substance (viśeṣya) and the Jīva to attribute (viśeṣaṇa),-as colour, dimension, etc., are attributes of paper, for instance. As attribute, Jīva is really different from Brahman-the substance: but as it always remains united with Brahman, the doctrine of 'Advaita' is established, and the Jīva-attribute, *can in this sense* of inseparable union be regarded as non-different from Brahman.[3] Here it can be said that from the practical point of view, the relation of Jīva and Brahman is difference and non-difference (bhedābheda).

In the second place Rāmānuja has also interpreted the relation of Jīva and Brahman as similar to the relation of soul-body.[4]

1 Vedānta-ratna-mañjūṣā, pp. 91.
2 Śrībhāṣya, 1.1.1.
3 Ibid,, 3.2.28.
4 Ibid., 1.1.1.

Jīva is declared to be the body (śarīra) of Brahman, which is śarīrī The śarīra does not exist without śarīrī, nor sarīrī without śarīra. Jīva is not non-different from Brahman on any account as similar to the relation of soul-body (Sarīrī-śarīra-sambandha) Jīva is really different from Brahman Jīva is entirely full of troubles or griefs At this stage, how can the "non difference" of Jīva with Brahman be possible ? Jīva is different from Brahman as śruti says ; "'He who dwells in the soul and within the soul, whom the soul does not know, of whom the soul is the body, who rules the soul within, he is thy soul, the ruler within, immortal,' 'He is the cause, the Lord of the lords of the organs',[2] 'there are two, knower-non-knower, born unborn, ruler-non-ruler'."[3] When Brahman is uninterrupted, at this stage, how can you say that the Jiva is the part of the Brahman? Rāmānuja says that Jīva is the part of Brahman or body is the part of the soul, like the case of sparks are the parts of fire [4] In this sense, then, all sentient and non-sentient beings together constitute the body of the supreme person, for they are completely controlled and supported by him for his own ends, and absolutely subordinate to him [5] In this manner, there is relation of non-difference between Jīva and Brahman Here it can be said that from the practical point of view the relation of Jīva and Brahman is difference and non-difference (bhedābheda) But the feeling of non-difference is always due to inseparable union between Jīva and Brahman Thus, there is relation between Jīva and Brahman as between the soul-body

Here *the term* body (*Sarīra*) is not used to denote bodies, such as human bodies, but to denote attributes, the substance being soul (sarīrī) Body (śarīra) means Aprthakasidha, i e, inseparable union, or a connection which has for ever existed, which

1 'Ya ātmani tiṣṭhannātmanontaro yamātmā na veda yasyātmā sarīram, ya ātmānamantro yamayati sa ta ātmāntaryāmyamratah' —Bṛh upa, III 7 22

2 'sa kāraṇam kāraṇādhipādhipah '—Svet, up VI 9

3 'jñājnau dvāvajāvisanīśau ?—Svet, up 1 9

4 Śrībhāṣya, 2 3 45

5 Srībhāṣya, 2 1 9 , Eng translation of George Thibaut

is not brought about at any intermediate period, and which can never cease.[1] Thus, there is an indissoluble union between Jīva and Brahman.

Hence, Rāmānuja calls his "viśiṣṭādvaitavāda" or the doctrine that the non-duality, or non-reality-Brahman-which is united with Jīva and acit as its attributes.

Thus, Rāmānuja explains the relation of Jīva and Brahman on the analogy of the substance-attribute (viśeṣya-viśeṣaṇa), or soul-body relation (śarīrī-śarīra sambandha) But Nimbārkācārya explains his doctrine, as it has already been observed, on the analogy of the cause-effect relation. And again, "The doctrine of Nimbārka has very much in common with that of Rāmānuja ; both regard the difference as well as the non-difference as real. But for Nimbārka, difference and non-difference are on the same level, they co-exist and have the same importance ; while for Rāmānuja, non-difference is the principal ; it is qualified by difference, which is thus subordinate to it."[2]

Another technical distinction between the two doctrines is that according to Rāmānuja, the Jīva is the attribute of Brahman, and Brahman thus, qualified by the Jīva, is a unity, omniscient, omnipotent. But though Jīva is the attribute of Brahman, yet is different from Him, otherwise the defect of the latter will pertain to the former.[3] But the school of Nimbārka refuses to admit this view for the following reason. The very task of an attribute or an adjective is to differentiate the particular object which possesses that particular attribute from other objects which do not possess it[4] e.g., the red colour of a red ball differentiates it from a blue ball and the rest. Now, in the very same manner, if Jīva be attribute of Brahman, the question at once

1 Bhashyacarya, N., F.T.S., "A Catechism of the Viśiṣṭādvaita Philosophy", Madras, 1887, Q. No. 69
2 Ghate, V.S., 'The Vedānta, Poona, 1960, p. 30.
3 Siddhānta-Kusumāñjali of Harivyāsdeva, p. 27.
4 Siddhānta-Jāhnavi of Devācārya, p. 43, 1.1.3.

arises: from whom or from what object do it differentiate Brahman? It cannot be said that it differentiate Brahman? *It cannot be said that it differentiate Brahman from itself (i.e.,* the Jīva), for that which differentiates can never be itself the object from which the original object (i.e., the object of which it is an attribute) is differentiated, e.g., it is absurd to say that the red colour of a red ball differentiates the ball from red colour. But nor can it be said that the Jīva diffentiates Brahman from any other object. Hence the Jīva cannot be attribute of Brahman. Moreover, the viśiṣṭādvaita view also-admits of a svābhāvika bheda between Brahman on the one hand *and the Jīva on* the other. *Hence instead of admitting* difference and non-difference *in this* round-about fashion, it is far better and reasonable to admit svābhāvika-bhedābheda all at once.[1]

3. *Bhāskara and Nimbārka*

Bhāskara explains the relation of Jīva and Brahman on the basis of upādhivāda, his theory may rightly be called "Aupādhika-Bhedābhedavāda" as distinguished *from* the doctrine of natural difference and non-difference (Svābhāvikabhedābhedavāda) of Nimbārka.

As it has already been observed that Brahman is the cause and Jīva is its effect. Being the cause of Brahman Jīva must be Brahman in nature and essence. During salvation Jīva is completely identical with Brahman. During effected state of Brahman, (during Baddāvasthā) as just shown Brahman-the cause, Jīva-the effect are identical in nature and essence. Hence non-difference of Jīva and Brahman is natural, eternal, real. But the difference of *Jīva and* Brahman is neither natural nor *eternal*; yet it is real. It is not natural because prior to creation, as shown above, Brahman and Jīva are absolutely identical, again as well as during *salvation, Brahman* and Jīva are *absolutely identical. Jīva is* different from Brahman only during the effected state of Brahman and Buddhāvasthā of Jīva. So this

1 Bose, Dr. Roma, "Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha" Vol. III, pp. 112-113; also, Vedāntatattvabodha of Anantarāma, pp. 27-32.

difference (bheda) is neither natural nor eternal but it is aupādhika, because, at the beginning of creation the Jīva comes to be associated with its upādhis, so it is different from Brahman.

Thus, according to Bhāskara, the non-difference (abheda) is natural, eternal and real, but difference (bheda) is only real, it is neither natural nor eternal.

Thus, according to Bhāskara Jīva is different and non-different from Brahman in bondage, and in salvation Jīva is absolutely identical with Brahman. But, for Nimbārka, Jīva is different and non-different from Brahman in bondage, as well as in salvation. And again, the doctrine of Nimbārka has very much in common with that of Bhāskara; because both regard the difference as well as non-difference as real. But, for Nimbārka, difference and non-difference are on the same level, they have same importance and both are equally natural, while for Bhāskara, difference is due to upādhis or limiting adjuncts, and non-difference is natural. In this manner, Bhāskara fundamentally differs from Nimbārka.

4. *Madhvācārya and Nimbārka*

Madhva explains the relation of Jīva and Brahman in the symbolism of "Bimbapratibimbabhāva" (the object-image concept).

"The term "Bimbapratibimbabhāva" is derived by Madhva from the significent passage in the Ṛgveda ;

'Rūpaṁ rūpaṁ pratirūpo babhūva
tadasya rūpaṁ praticakṣaṇaya

(vi. 47, 18)

The underlying idea in all these expressions is the same, viz., that Brahman is the one independent source of all reality, consciousness and activity found in the individual selves and which cannot therefore be explained without reference to their dependence on Brahman for their being. As no creation of Jīvas is admitted the figure of pratibimba should be literally constructed in the sense of the Jīvas, being the actual reflections projected by Brahman like that of a concrete substance on a mirror. Madhva

warns his readers against taking the scriptural descriptions of the Jīva as a pratibimba of the Brahman in its gross physical sense of an actual reflection That is why he is so careful and particular to insist that there is no medium of reflection (upādhi) in this case. This would at once bring out the difference Madhva's and Sankara's conception of the Jīva as a pratibimba of Brahman. According to the latter, the Jīva is false appearance or projection of the Brahman on the screen of Avidyā. This relation can be transcended : "Jīvatvam ca mṛṣā jñeyaṁ rajvāṁ sarpagrāho yathā" (Aparokṣānubhūti, 43)

But, to Madhva, the relation of Bimbapratibimbabhāva between God and the souls is a sacred and inviolable relation, which is true for all time and goes to the very core of the Jīva and constitutes his very essence and could never be annulled Its full significance, missed in Samsāra, is realized in Mokṣa Mokṣa, in fact, is the complete realization of this intrinsic relation as metaphysical dependence and similarity (in some respects) with the supreme Pratibimbatva, according to Madhva, is not a false relation, of which the Jīvas are to be ashemed and should try to shake off, as in Advaita It is the truest and most beautiful permanent bond with the Supreme being and the purpose of philosophy is its progressing realization, by the Jīva two doctrine are thus diametrically opposed !"[1]

Madhva in his Bhāsya on Brahmasūtra "Ābhāsa eva ca"[2] discusses the theory of "Bimbapratibimbabhāva", Jīva is the reflection (pratibimba) of the Brahman According to him a pratibimba is of two kinds :—

"Sopādhiranupādhisca pratibimbo dvidheyate/Jīvaisasyānu pādhirindracāpoya tharaveritipengiśruteh "[3]

One is sopādhika, i e , which is dependent on external media, and the other is Nirupādhika, i e , the one which is not so dependent Madhvācārya cites a illustration of the rainbow as an

---

1 Sharma, Dr B N K , "Philosophy of Srī Madhvācārya", pp 218-219, Bombay, 1962

2 Madhva-Brahmasūtrabhāṣya, 2 3 50, p 93

3 Ibid , p 93

instance of a Nirupādhika reflection of the sun's rays, to elucidate his conception of the Jīva as a Nirupādhika reflection of Iśwara.

"The illustration of rainbow as the nirupādhika reflection of sun may at the first sight appear incongruous because it is incompatible with the scientific truth, that the phenomenon of rainbow in the sky is due to the reflection of sun's rays in the cloud or the atmospheric and anupādhika or nirupādhika reflections would bring out the sense in which Madhva asserts the anupādhika character of rainbow and would specify the distinction between these two forms of pratibimba (reflection)[8]". Again Madhva quotes analogy of a man and his shadow from the śruti, to make clear the relation of metephysical dependence between Jīva and Brahman. As śruti says : "Yathaiṣā puruṣe chāyā etasminnetadātatam (Praśno upa. III.).

"The analogy of "Chāyāpuruṣa" conveys the idea that God is immeasurably more than and superior to the souls, as the substance is greater than its shadow. The shadow is there because of the substance. It is bound to the substance ; but not vice-versa. The dependence is thus unilateral and not reciprocal. The shadow is outwardly similar to the substance, in form. The souls have the same form of reality. Consciousness and bliss, resembling Brahman's. It should always be remembered that analogies should not be stretched indefinitely. The point of the analogy is strictly confined to the ideas of dependence and similarity and nothing more."[3]

The relation of part and whole (aṁśāṁśibhāva), also conveys the same truth of dependence and similarity : "Jīvasya parameśwarāṁśatvam tu, tatsādrasyam tadadhinasattadimattvam cetyarthah/" (Nyāya-Sudhā II, pp. 453b) Jiva is part (aṁśa) of the Brahman, it is clearly apparent that Madhva always tried to

1 Narain, Dr. K., "An Outline of Mādhva Philosophy", Allahabad, 1962, pp. 143-144.

2 Madhva-Brahmasūtrabhāṣya, p. 93.

3 Sharma, Dr. B.N.K., "Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya", Bombay, 1962, pp. 219-220.

establish the nature *and existence of Jiva as separate from that of* Brahman. Brahman is the cause of the nature and existence of Jīva just as father is cause[1] of the existence of his son Madhva does not accept the relation of difference and non-difference (*bhedābheda between Jīva and Brahman, but he accepts fundamental* difference and substitutes aṁśatva for "Non difference"[2] Madhva distinguishes two kinds of Aṁśas ! Savrūpāṁśa and bhinnāṁśa[3] Matsya and *Kūrma are svarūpāṁśa of the Brahman Jīvas are* bhinnāṁśas of Brahman

Thus, in the words of Jayatirth the difference (bheda) is not absolute but eternal[4]

Thus, the doctrine of Nimbnrka is completely different from the doctrine of Madhvācārya, because according to *Nimbārka both difference* and non-difference are equally real, while in the doctrine of Madhvācārya the difference (bheda) alone that is real, and non-difference has no place in his doctrine *It is the* main difference between the doctrines of Nimbārka and Madhvācārya

And again, it establishes that in the doctrine of natural difference and non-difference (svābhāvikabhedābhedavāda) of Nimbārka there is no such contradiction as in the Madhva doctrine viz Madhva doctrine of only difference (bhedavāda), has to accept many texts like "All this indeed is *Brahman*", as subordinate ones

5 *Vallabhācārya and Nimbārka*

The doctrine of vallabha is called "Suddhādvaita", i e, "pure non-duality" The compound 'Suddhādvaita' can be dissolved

---

1 "mām rakṣatu vibhurnityam putroham paramātmanah"
—Madhva-Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya, p 90

2 "ataścāmśatvamuddiṣṭam bhedābhedau na mukhyatah"
—Madhva-Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya, p 91

3 "svāmśaścatho vibhinnāṁśa *iti* dvedhāniśa isyate"
—Madhva-Bhahmasūtra-bhāṣya, pp 92, 2 3 47

4 "Jivātmanah paramātmanā ātyantikabhedah *samarthyate* (Nyaāya-sudhā, p 435), parantu, na jivo brahmano ghata iva patātatyantabhinnah *(Nyāya-sudhā, 453 b)* "

in two ways : 'Śuddham ca tadadvaitam', or, the non-duality of Brahman that is pure, without any connection with māyā ; and, 'Śuddhayoḥ advaitaṁ', or the non-duality of the universe and the Brahman that is pure, without any connection with Māyā.[1] According to vallabha, the Jīva and the inanimate world are essentially the same as Brahman, so there is non-duality between Jīva, Jagat and the Brahman.

In this manner, according to Vallabha, the relation of Jīva and Brahman is "pure non-duality". Jīva is the part of Brahman. As the sparks of the fire are not different from their original the fire, the Jīva also is not different from Brahman, viz., Jīva is identical with Brahman.[2] Vallabhācārya admits the 'Pariṇāmavāda' (transformation). In his doctrine the Jīva is transformation of the Brahman, but he admits "immutable transformation" (avikṛtapariṇāmavāda), i.e., that which does not undergo change. Just as gold, even when moulded into ornaments of different shapes and sizes and comes to be known as 'bracelets', 'rings' etc., remains unaffected by these changes pertaianing to those ornaments and does not lose its essence, in the same way, the Lord manifests His qualities of sat, cit and Ānanda in the Jīva, the Jagat and the Antaryāmin forms of his, without himself undergoing any change whatever. This is also supported by Sūtras like "Ātmakṛtah pariṇāmāt" and so on.[3] The relation between Jīva and Brahman is thus that of identity (advaita), which is pure (Śuddhādvaita).

---

1 Śuddhādvaitapade jñeyaḥ samāsaḥ karmadhārayaḥ
advaitam śuddhayoḥ prāhuḥ ṣaṣṭhitatpuruṣam budhaḥ (127)
Māyā-sambandha-rahitam Śuddhamityacyate budhaih
kārya-kāraṇa-rūpam hi śuddam Brahmaṇa māyikam (128)
—Śuddhādvaitamārtaṇḍa.

2 Aṇubhāṣya, 2.3.43.

3 (a) Yathā suvarṇam sukratam purastāt paścāsccāt
sarvasya hiraṇmayasya
tadeva madhye vyavahāryamānam nānāpadeśairahamasya
tadvat
—Śrīmadbhāgavat.

(b) Mridula I. Marfatia, "The Philosophy of Vallabhācārya", pp. 55-56, Delhi, 1967.

Thus, the doctrine of Nimbārka is completely different from the doctrine of vallabhācārya, because, according to Nimbārka both difference and non-difference are equally real, while in the docrine of vallabhācārya the non-difference (abheda) alone that is real, and difference has no place in his doctrine. It is the main difference between the doctrines of Nimbārka and Vallabhācārya Dr. V S Ghate, says, "For vallabha, it is non-difference (abheda) alone that is real (vāstavika), which *all difference is simply for the sake of sport*, in opposition to both Rāmānuja and Nimbārka According to these latter, though both difference and non-difference are theoretically equally real (vāstavika) *It is difference only that is* real, while the non-difference is accounted for by the similarity of nature and between Brahman and Jiva or by the relation of dependence between the two (niyamya-niyantrtva) [1]

6 *Śrīkrsnacaitanya and Nimbārka*

Śrīkrṣnacaitanya explains the relation of Jīva and Brahman like Nimbārka According to him, the mutual difference in nature and concept of Brahman and Jiva is obvious, as already observed, that Brahman is all knowing, all-powerful and omniscient, *while the Jiva is knowing little and has limited power* Brahman is absolute, while Jiva is atomic. Brahman is creator, supporter, destroyer, while Jiva is created, supported and controlled by Brahman

In reality, there is mutual non-difference In the three aspects of knowledge, existence and bliss viz , sat cit and ānanda of Brahman, these two Brahman and Jīva are identical

Thus, like Nimbārka, there is relation of both difference and non-difference between Jiva and Brahman.

On the other hand, like Nimbārka, this relation of difference and non-difference between Jiva and Brahman is in bondage as well as in salvation The mukta Jiva appears to be entirely identical with Brahman, being knowledge, existence and bliss viz , sat, cit and ānanda of Brahman , but, the mukta Jiva, too,

1Ghate, V S , "The Vedānta", Poona, 1960, p 35

is different from the Brahman in two respects. Thus, first, even a mukta Jīva is atomic[1] while Brahman is all-pervading ; and even the Mukta Jīva no doubt *creates the Pitṛloka and Mātṛ-loka*, etc., as we learn from the chā. upa., but his creation has this limitation, that it is a local creation only different from the creation of the Supreme Brahman, who creates the whole universe, consisting of spirit and matter, sustains it and dissolves it back into Himself. This power belongs to Brahman alone and to no Mukta Jīva.[2] In this sense Mukta Jīva is different from Brahman. The Mukta Jīva is equal to God in matters of enjoyment only ; not essentially and absolutely equal to the lord.[3]

Thus, like Nimbārka *in the philosophy of Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya* both difference and non-difference are tıue. He accepts both difference and non-difference as incompatible and inconceiveable theory true. Nimbārka accepts both difference and non-difference to be equally true and compatible as well. The doctrine of Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya may, therefore, be called "acintya-bhedābhedavāda," which may be translated as "inconceiveable relation of simultaneous difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman", as which is distinguished from the doctrine of natural difference and non-difference (Svābhāvika-bhedābhedavāda) of Nimbārka.

7. *Śrīkanṭha and Nimbārka*

In the first place, according to Śrīkanṭha, like Nimbārka there is an essential difference between Jīva and Brahman. Brahman is by nature a store of all auspicious qualities, independent and ever-free from all defects, does not become subject to the faults of the Jīva, while the Jīva is dependent, becomes deluded and grieves,' i.e., remains marged in the ocean of sorrows, brought about by the great delusion.[4] There is a difference between Jīva

1 Govinda-bhāṣya, English Translation, Ed. by Basu, B.D., Allahabad, 1912, 4.4.20.

1 Govinda-bhāṣya, English Translation, Ed. by Basu, B.D., Allahabad, 1912, 4.4.17, p. 765.

2 Govinda-bhāṣya, 4.4.21.

4 Śrīkanṭha-bhāṣya, Eng. Translation by Dr. (Mrs.) Roma Chaudhuri, Calcutta, 1958, 1.2.11, p. 96.

and Brahman in respect of their qualities, viz, knowledge and ignorance, independence and dependence and so on[1] Again, Brahman is the object to be worshipped, while Jīva is the worshipper[2] Jīva and Brahman are related as the 'directed' and the 'director', as the body and the soul[3] Hence the mutual difference between Jīva and Brahman is obvious Brahman is the director, while Jīva is the directed Brahman is the Lord of the world and never the Jiva Hence, Jiva is different from Brahman[4] Thus, Jīva is different in nature from Brahman[5]

But, if, on the one hand, Jīva is different from Brahman, on the other, Jīva is also non-different from Brahman Jīva as effect and part of Brahman, is different from Brahman, the cause and the whole, but as effect and part, again, Jīva is also non-different from Brahman There is non differece between Jīva and Brahman, as they stand in a relation of the pervaded and the pervader[6] Here Srīkantha perfectly agrees with Nimbārka

Thus, according to Srīkaṇtha, it is established that there is both difference and non difference (Bhedābheda) between Jīva and Brahman But Srikantha says difference and non difference (Bhedābhedavāda) is not tenable He replies that no such difference and non-difference is to be apprehended here, for we only establish the doctrine of Non difference as qualified by difference (*Viśiṣṭādvaita*)[7] We do not maintain that there is an absolute difference between Brahman and the universe, as between a pot and a piece of cloth For, that would be oppossed to the scriptural texts maintaining the non-difference between the two Again we do not maintain that there is an absolute difference (between the two) as between the nacre and the silver For, if

1 Srīkantha-bhāṣya, 1 2 11, p 96
2 *Ibid*, *1 2 2*, p 84
3 Ibid, 1 2 12, p 96
4 Ibid, 1 3 44, p 142
5 Ibid, 2 3 45, p 241
6 Ibid, 2 3 42, p 240
7 "Bhedābhedakalpanam viśiṣṭādvaitam *sādhayāmah*"
—Srīkantha bhāsya, 2 1 22

one of these two be false, then that would contradict the scriptural texts maintaining the difference between them in respect of natural qualities. Further, we do not also, maintain that there is both difference and non-difference (between the two) for that would be self contradictory. But we maintain that the relation between Brahman and the world is that non-difference (or Brahman) is qualified by difference (or the world), as the embodied being is by its body, as the substance is by its attribute.[1]

Thus, Śrīkaṇṭha explains the relation of Jīva and Brahman on the analogy of the soul-body (*śarīrī-śarīra*), substance-attribute (viśeṣya-viśeṣaṇa), and the cause-effect relation (kārya-kāraṇa sambandha).

The non-difference between the Jīva and Brahman simply means that the Jīva-the effect and the Brahman its cause, the Jīva-the attribute and the Brahman its substance, the Jīva-the body and the Brahman its soul, none can exist in absence of the other, as in the case of a pot and clay. A pot is never found without blueness. In the same manner the power (śakti) viz. the Jīva can never exist without Brahman, while, Brahman, too, is never known to be without His power viz., the Jīva, just as fire is never without heat. If a thing cannot be known without another thing then the first is qualified by the second. The second thing (the attribute) is the first thing (the substance) *in essence*. Hence, it is said that Brahman is non-separable from and necessarily connected with the Jīva. On the other hand *the difference* (between the two), too, is natural. Hence, the Brahman is, indeed, superior to the Jīva. Just as the soul *is non-drfferent* from the body in nature and superior to it, just as the substance is non-different from attribute in nature and superior *to it* ; *just* as *the* cause is non-different from the effect in nature and superior to it.[2]

---

1 (i) "na ca bhedābhedavādinah, vastuvirodhāt
kintu Śarīraśarīrīnoriva ca viśiṣṭādvaita vādinah"
—Śrīkaṇṭha-bhāṣya, 2.1.22.

(ii) Śrīkaṇṭha-bhāṣya, Eng. Translation by Dr. (Mrs.) Roma Chaudhuri, 2.1. 22, p. 181.

2 Śrīkaṇṭha-bhāṣya, 2.1.22, pp. 181-182.

Hence, Srīkantha calls his doctrine "Visiṣṭā-Sivādvaita' [2] viz , the doctrine that Siva possessing the universe consisting of the sentient and the non-sentient, as his body, is one without a second, and he is both the cause and the effect

Thus, the doctrine, of Nimbārka has very much in common with that of Srīkantha (as with Rāmānuja) , both regard the difference as well as the non difference as real, in the same sense But for Nimbārka, difference and non difference (Bhedabheda) are on the same level, they co exist, and have the same importance , while for Srikantha (as for Rāmānuja) non difference is the principal , it is qualified by difference, which is thus subordinate to it

Another technical distinction may be possible between the doctrines of Srīkantha and Nimbārka, like another technical distinction between the doctrines of Rāmānuja and Nimbārka, as it has already been observed above

Thus, the main difference between Srikantha and Nimbārka consists in their doctrines with regard to the relation of difference and non-difference, between Brahman on the one hand, Jīva on the other

8 *Śripati and Nimbārka*

It has already been observed that, like Nimbārka, Srīpati calls his doctrine Bhedābheda and dvaitādvaita There is difference between Jīva and Brahman in bondage Brahman is the object of worship, all pervasive and omniscient, while Jīva is worshipper, has spatial limitation and possesses limited know ledge But at the salvation Jīva is identical with Brahman This identity is natural as well as of form And again, like Nimbārka, Srīpati tells us that both difference and non difference are natural

Thus, the doctrine of Nimbārka has very much in common with that of Srīpati, both regard the difference as well as the non difference as natural But for Nimbārka, identity is not of form unlike difference where as for Sripati identity is not only

1 Srīkantha bhāsya, 2 1 14, 2 1 22 pp 174 181

natural but also of form like difference. And again according to Śrīpati, difference holds only in bondage and identity in mukti ; So that identity and difference are not found simultaneously but are found at different times. But for Nimbārka, there is the relation of both difference and non-difference between the Jīva and the Brahman in bondage as well as in salvation ; so that difference and non-difference are found simultaneously.

CONCLUSION

The above views of different philosophers show that the problem of the relation of Jīva and Brahman cannot be easily brought under any well known logical category, such as identity, difference and difference and non-difference

On one hand there are absolute non-dualistic doctrines, such as the Advaitavāda of Śankara, and the "Śuddhādvaita of vallabha" in which Jīva is completely identical with Brahman, and on the other hand, there are absolute dualistic doctrines, such as Dvaita-vāda of Madhva, in which Jīva is completely different from the Brahman

And again, there are doctrines of Nimbārka, Rāmānuja, Bhāskara, Srīkṛṣnacaitanya, Śrīkantha and Śrīpati All of them accept the relation of both difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman, to be equally real, but all of them try to reconcile them in different ways Nimbārka accepts the relation of both difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman, which is to be equally natural (svābhāvika) and completely compatible Rāmānuja and Srīkantha explains the relation of Jīva and Brahman on the analogy of soul and body (Sarīri-śarīra) in which non-difference is the principal, it is qualified by difference, which is thus subordinate to it Bhāskara regards the difference and non-difference to be equally real but he takes difference to be aupādhika and non-difference to be natural and real Srīkṛṣnacaitanya regards the difference and non-difference as inconceiveable (acintya) Śrīpati regards the difference and non-difference to be equally natural, but he takes that identity is not only natural but also of form

But considering the above doctrines, Nimbārka's main contribution seems to be very reasonable, both from the philosophical and theological points of view Nimbārka elucidates his point about the relation between Jīva and Brahman, by the analogy of the cause and the effect (or the part and the whole relation),

as it has been observed. The effect (or the part) is different from its cause (or the whole) in attributes and powers, forms and functions. A clay—jar, for example, is different from a lump of clay, in this sense that the lump has a round shape ; The jar an oblong one ; the lump is black ; the jar, brown, the lump is soft ; the jar hard ; we can besmear the floor with the lump. but cannot fetch water by it, and so on. But on the other hand, the effect is non-different from the cause, in essence, being but its transformation ; for example, a clay jar, an effect, is non-different from the lump of clay—the cause, in essence, both being equally clay.

Hence, the relation between the cause and its effects (or the part and the whole) to neither one of pure non-difference (abheda) nor one of pure difference (bheda) but one of natural difference and non-difference (Svābhāvika-Bhedābheda), both of which are equally real.

The very same is the case with Jīva and Brahman. The Jīva is the effect (or the part) of the Brahman, and the Brahman is the cause (or the whole) of the Jīva. The mutual difference between Jīva and Brahman is obvious. As it has already been observed that Brahman is of the nature of all-pervasive, omnisicient and independent, while Jīva is knowing little and dependent on Brahman, and so on. But on the other hand, Jīva is non-different from the Brahman, because it is after all nothing but Brahman. To conclude this present note, it may be illustrated by well known example of Brahma-Sūtra, which is "Ahikuṇḍalavat". In this present illustration 'ahikuṇḍalvat' the serpent is the cause of the coil and the coil is the effect of the serpent. The serpent is indepentent, while the coil is dependent. On the one hand, it shows the difference between the serpent and its coil. On the other hand, the existence and activity of coil is impossible in the absence of the serpent. It shows the non-difference of the serpent and its coil. Likewise, the relation of Jīva—the effect (or the part ; transformation), with the Brahman —the cause (or the whole), is natural difference and non-difference (Svābhāvika-bhedābheda). This relation of both difference

and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman is in bondage as well as in salvation Mukta Jīva is non-different from Brahman, being knowledge, existence and bliss in assence (Saccidānandas-varūpa) , but it too, is different from Brahman in two respects In the first place, Mukta Jīva is atomic while Brahman is all-pervading , and in the second place of Mukta Jīva lacks the power of creation on which Brahman possesses fully and eternally.

Thus, there is relation of both difference and non-difference between Jīva and Brahman in bondage as well as in salvation, which is to be equally real and compatible The testimony of various scriptures proves the natural difference and non-difference of Jīva and Brahman There is no such contradiction, in the doctrine of Natural difference and non-difference (Svābhāvikabhedābheda-vāda) of Śrīnimbārkācārya, as we find in some vedāntic systems, such as · the follower of 'dvaitavāda', has to accept many texts like 'Sarvaṁ Khalvidaṁ Brahma', as subordinate ones, and the followers of 'Advaitavāda', have to accept many texts, which determine difference, as subordinate ones

However, Nimbārka's very special contribution seems, as regards the relation of Jīva and Brahman, to be very reasonable So even-now Nimbārka-school has a best place and a great importance in Indian-devotees "In fact, 'Bheda' and 'Abheda' have both been admitted by all the Monitheistic School of Vedānta (except, of course, that of Madhva) . But none has been able to put the two, exactly on the same level, same status, like Nimbārka What a great and glorious conglomeretion ! An infinite number of Gods in essence, eternally worshipping the one, universal God, from within, like the rays in the sun, like the ripples, in a river, like the flowers in a tree, manifesting his light, singing his praise, spreading His Fragrance What a superb, sublime, sweet conception "'[1]

---

1 Chaudhuri, Dr (Mrs) Roma, "Nimbārka's Theory of Self," "Finite-Self", Ed by Swami B H Bon Mahāraj, Vrindaban, 1963

In words of Pt. Anantarām Śāstri, "Tasmādakāmairapi cidacidīśvarāṇām svābhāvikabhedābhedameva sambandhaṁ aṅgīkṛtya punarviśiṣṭatvāṅgikāro gauravāvahopyanupapannopi svasampradāyasya svātantryasiddhyartha iti siddhaṁ.

—Vedānta-tattva-bodha, pp. 32.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 Annambhatta (i) Tarka Sangrah, Kasi, 1939 (ii) Tarka-Sangrah, Ed and translated by Y V Athalye and M R Bodas, Poona, 1963

2 Anantaram Shāstri Vedānta-tattvabodha, Benares, 1908

3 Bādarāyana Brahma Sutra

4 Baladeva Vidyābhūsana (i) Govinda bhāsya on Brahma sūtra, Mathura, Samvat 2011 (ii) Govinda bhāsya, English Translation and Ed by B D Basu, Allahabad, 1912

5 Bhandarkar, R G Vaisnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems, Varanasi, 1965

6 Bhāskara Bhāskara bhāsya on Brahma Sutra Chow Sans Series, First Edition

7 Bhāsyacarya, N, F T S A Catechism of the Visiṣṭādvaita Philosophy, Madras, 1887

8 Bhattacarya Tara Sankara Relation according to the New School of Indian Logic (Navya-Nyāya)', Journal of Ganganath Jha Research Institute, Allahabad, Vol II, Pts 4, 1945

9 Bon Maharaj, B H Finite-Self, Institute of Oriental Philosophy, Vrindavan, 1963

10 Bose, Roma Vedānta pārijāta saurabha and Vedānta Kaustubha (in English Translation), Vols I, II, III, Calcutta, 1943

11 Brajesaprasada Śruti siddhānta manjari on Saviśeṣa nirvises Krsnastvarāj Chow Sans Series No 141, Benares, 1908

12 Brhadaranyakopaniṣad With the Commentary of Sankara and the glossary of Anandgiri, Ed by D E Roer, Calcutta

13 Chāndogyopanisad

14 Chaudhuri, Dr (Mrs) Roma (i) "Brahman Jiva Jagat relation—A unique theory of aupādhikabhedabhedavāda, Proceedings and transactions of the All India Oriental Conference 22nd Session, Gauhati, Assam, January, 1965 (ii) "Nimbārka's Theory of Self', Finite Self, Ed by B H Bon Maharaj, Vrindavan, 1963

15. Chaudhuri, Tara Sankara Sharma. Brahmavādi-ṛsi aur Brahmavidyā (in Bengali), Śakabda 1833, Calcutta.

16. Dasgupta, S. N.: History of Indian Philosophy, Vols. I, III, Cambridge.

17. Devācārya : Siddhānta-Jāhnavi, with the commentary "Dvaitādvaita-siddhānta-Setukā", by Sundarabhatta, Chow. Sans. Series, No. *94*, *99* and *358*, Benares, 1906-1927.

18. Ghate, V. S.: The Vedānta, Poona, 1960.

19. Giridhara : Śuddhādvaita-Mārtanda, Chow. Sans. Series, No. 97.

20. Gītā : Gītā Press, Gorakhpur.

21. Harivyāsadevācārya : Siddhānta-Kusumāñjali on Dasaślokī of Nimbārka, Niranyasagar Press, Bombay.

22. Hiriyana, Prof. M.: "Bhaṛtṛprapañca—An Old Vedānti", *Proceedings and Transactions* of All India Oriental Conference III, Madras, 1924, and Indian Antiquary, Vol. LIII, 1924.

23. Iyer and Pandey : Śaiva Theory of Relation, Allahabad, 1938.

24. Jayatirtha : Nyāya-Sudhā, Niranyasagar Press, Bombay.

25. Jha, Pt. Bhagirath : Dvaitādvaitavivekaḥ, Vrindavan, 1945.

26. Jhalkikar, Bhimacarya : Nyāya-Kośa, Poona, 1928.

27. Jīvagoswāmi : (i) Saṭsandarbha, Calcutta, Śakabda 1822. (ii) Sarva-Saṁvādinī, Radhakunda (Mathura), Samvat 2022.

28. Joshi, Rasika Vihari : (i) "A Note on the Doctrine of Non-difference of Nimbārka", East and West, Vol. *15*, Nos. *1-2*, January *1964*, March 1965, ISMEO, Rome (Italy). (ii) "The Role of Indian Logic in the Doctrine of Causality", "Mélanges D' indianisme" a la mémoire De Louis Renou", Paris, 1968. (iii) Le Rituel de la devotion Krsnaite, Pondichery, 1959. (iv) A Notion Guru, Dikṣa, and Mantra ; *Ethnos*, Stock-holm (Sweden). (v) Catutślokī or Saptaślokī Bhāgavata—A Critical Study—Puranon, Vol. XVI, No. 1, January, 1974, *Varanasi*.

29. Kaṭhopaniṣad.

30. Keśava Kāśamīrībhatta : (i) Kaustubha-prabhāvṛtti, Delhi, 1938. (ii) Tattva-prakāśikā on Gītā, Hindi translation by Kalika Singh, Burdhavan, 1935.

31. Keśavamiśra : Tarka-bhāṣā, Ed by Acārya Viśveśwara, Benares, 1963
32. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa . (i) Mimāṅsāślokavārtika, with the Commentary Kāśika of Sucāritamiśra, Part III, Trivendrum, 1943. (ii) Ślokavārtika, Eng Translation by Ganganath Jha, Allahabad, 1905.
33. Lakuliśa : Pāsupata-sūtra, Oriental Manuscripts Library Travankor University, Trivendrum, 1940
34. Madhvācārya Madhva-brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya, Calcutta, 1881
35. Mādhvācārya : Sarva-darśana-sangrah, Eng Translation by E B Cowell and A E Gough, Benares, 1961
36. Madhvamukunda Parapakṣagiribajra, Mathura, Samvat 1993
37. Misra, Umesh : Nimbārka School of Vedānta, Allahabad, 1963
38 Mridula I Marfatia The Philosophy of Vallabhācārya, Delhi, 1967
39 Mundakopaniṣad
40 Narain, Dr K An Outline of Mādhva Philosophy, Allahabad, 1962
41 Nimbārkācārya : (i) Saviśeṣa-nirviśesa-Kṛṣna-stavarāj, Benares (ii) (a) Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, Benares, 1932 (b) Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha, Eng Translation by Roma Bose, Calcutta, 1943 (iii) Vedānta-Kāmadhenu, Benares, 1907.
42 Otto Strauss "Jiva and Parāmatman", D R Bhandarkar Volume, Calcutta, 1940
43 Pandey, Dr K C (i) Bhāskari Vols I, III, Ed by Iyer and Pandey, Allahabad, 1938 (ii) "Dualism-cum-Monism (Bhedābhedavāda)", Journal of Ganganath Jha Research Institute, Allahabad, Vol XX-XXI, Pts 1-4, Nov 1963, August 1965 (iii) Saivadarśanavindu, Benares, Samvat 2021
44 Prakāsātman Pañcapadikavivaranam, Vol III, Viziana-gram Sans Series, 1892
45 Purusottamprasāda Vaiṣnava I (i) Srutyanta-Kalpavalli, on Saviśeṣa-nirviśeṣa-Kṛsnastvarāj, Chow Sans Series, No 356, 357, Benares, 1927 (ii) Vedānta-ratna-mañjūsā, on Vedānta-kamadhenu, Benares, 1907
46 Purusottamprasad Vaisnava II Srutyanta-sura druma, Chow Sans Series, No 135, Benares, 1907

47. Radhagovindanatha "A Survey of the Caitanya Movement", The Cultural Heritage of India, Vol. IV, Calcutta, 1956.
48. Radhakrishnan, S.: Indian Philosophy, Vol. II, London, 1927.
49. Rāmānujācārya : (i) Śrī-bhāṣya on Brahma-Sūtra, Ed. by A. V. Narasimhacari, Madras, 1909-10. (ii) Śri-bhāṣya, Eng. Trans. by George Thibaut, Sacred Books of East, Delhi. (iii) Vedārtha-Sangrah, Bhagvad Rāmānuja Granthamala, Granthmala Office, Kanchipuram, 1956.
50. Śabara Swāmi : Śābara-bhāṣya Calcutta, 1883.
51. Śankarācārya : (i) Śānkara-bhāṣya on Brahma-Sūtra, Niranyasagar Press, Bombay, 1938. (ii) Śāṅkara-bhāṣya on Brahma-Sūtra, Eng. Trans. by George Thibaut, Sacred Books of East, Delhi. (iii) Śānkara-bhāṣya on Bṛhadāraṇyakopanisad, Eng. Trans. by Swami Mādhvānanda, Advaita Asram, Calcutta, 1934.
52. Sastri, S. Kuppuswami: A Primer of Indian Logic, Madras, 1951.
53. Shastri, Prof. Rampratap : Iśādyoṣtopaniṣad, Mathura, 1937.
54. Sharma, Dr. B. N. K. : Philosophy of Srī Madhvācārya, Bombay, 1962.
55. Siauve Suzanne : La Doctrine De Madhva, Pondicherry, 1968.
56. Srīkanṭha : Śrīkanṭha-bhāṣya on Brahma-sūtra, Eng. Trans. by Dr. (Mrs.) Roma Chaudhuri, Calcutta, 1959.
57. Srinivasachari, Prof. P. N. : The Philosophy of Bhedābheda, The Adyar Library, 1950.
58. Srīnivāsa (the immediate disciple of Nimbārka) : Vedānta-Kaustubha, Benares, 1932.
59. Śrīmadbhāgavat : Gītā, Press, Gorakhpur,
60. Śripati Panditācārya : Śrīkara-bhāṣya on Brahma-Sūtra, Vols. I, II, Ed. by C. Hayavadana Rao, Bangalore. 1936.
61. Sudarsanabhaṭṭa : Śrūtiprākaśikā on Śrībhāsya, Vol. II, Ed. by Govt. of India, New Delhi, 1967.
62. Sundaranandavidyavinod : (i) Srīcaitanyadeva (in Hindi), Calcutta, 1953. (ii) Acintyabhedābhedavāda (in Bengali), Calcutta, 1951.
63. Sureśwarācārya : Bṛhadāranyakopanisad bhāsya-vārtikam, Anandasram Sans. Series, Bombay, 1893.
64. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣhad.
65. Taittirīyāraṇyaka.

66 Taittirīya Upaniṣad

67. Th Stcherbatsky Buddhist Logic, Vol I, Bibliotheca-Buddhist, Academy of Science, USSR, 1958

68 Utpaladeva Sambandhasiddhi, Srinagar, 1921

69. Upadhyaya, Baladeva Bhartiya-Darśana (in Hindi), Kasi, 1960

70 Vācapatimiśra Bhāmati on Sāṅkarabhāṣya on Brahma-sūtra, Niranyasagar, Bombay, 1938

71. Vallabhācārya Anu-bhāsya on Brahma-Sūtra, First Edition, Govt Central Press, Bombay, 1921.

72 Vātsyāyana Vātsyāyana-bhāsya on Nyāya-Sūtra, Poona, 1939.

73. Viśvanāth Pancānana (i) Bhāsā-parichheda, Ed and Trans by D E Roer (Bibliotheca Indicā) (ii) Kārikāvali, Ed by Sarma, Srichandrahari Singh, Darabhanga, 1939

74 Vrijavidehī, Swami Santadāsa Vedānta Darsana (in Hindi and Bengali), Allahabad, Samvat 1968, Calcutta, Sakabda 1849

75 Waltair, P T Raju "Identity in Difference in Some Vedāntic Systems", New Indian Antiquary, Vol II, Bombay, 1939-40

INDEX